

July 08, 2019

RECEIVED

JUL 8 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor North
P.O Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Re: Nelson Hess v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

Docket No. C-2018-3003337

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing is the Exceptions to Administrative Law Judge Elizabeth H. Barnes Initial Ruling dated June 11, 2019 in the above referenced proceeding. Copies will be provided as indicated on the enclosed Certificate of Service.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nelson Hess', written in a cursive style.

Nelson Hess

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

RECEIVED

JUL 8 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

**Nelson Hess,
Complainant**

v.

Docket Number: C-2018-3003337

**PPL Electric Utilities Corporation,
Respondent**

**EXCEPTIONS OF COMPLAINANT NELSON HESS
TO THE INITIAL DECISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
ELIZABETH H. BARNES ISSUED ON JUNE 11, 2019**

Dated July 08, 2019

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	2
Exception No. 1: The ALJ erred in the introduction.	2
Exception No. 2: The ALJ erred by accepting the testimony, written statements and exhibits from Christopher Davis, PhD.	2
Exception No. 3: The ALJ erred in accepting any testimony, written statement or exhibits from Dr. Israel.	4
Exception No. 4: The ALJ erred in not acknowledging and defending Act 129	4
Exception No. 5: The ALJ erred in using the flawed and biased research of Mark Israel and Christopher Davis.	4
Exception No. 6: The ALJ erred in accepting Christopher Davis as an expert witness who collaborated with Curtis Renner to destroy my credibility. The ALJ erred in accepting Mark Israel as an expert witness.	5
Exception No. 7: The ALJ erred when bringing up my cell phone usage as my cell phone is not the issue at hand.	6
Exception No. 8: The ALJ erred when the preponderance of evidence was right there in the courtroom in favor of the complainant.	6
Exception No. 9: The ALJ erred concerning a provision for customers to opt out.	9
Conclusion.....	10

Introduction

I request that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC) overrule the Initial Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Elizabeth Barnes and issue a Final Order that allows me to retain my analog meter. This is due to legitimate health concerns, safety and cyber security issues surrounding hacking and privacy.

The interpretation of Act 129 and the enforcement resulting in the forced deployment of smart meters upon the residents of Pennsylvania was not the true intention of the Legislatures when it was passed. The enforcement of this law will harm the residents of the state of Pennsylvania, some sooner than others but everyone will be affected by long term exposure. Just like the tobacco issue, one day everyone will realize the dangers, but much damage would have been done.

I was not able to hire legal counsel or expert witnesses. I have no legal training; have limited time and energy to pursue this very important fight to keep my analog electric meter. I was in a David vs. Goliath situation at my Hearing on May 14, 2019. I was not fully prepared and was not feeling well while facing an attorney (Devin Ryan) and the ALJ (Elizabeth Barnes) with four so-called expert witnesses on the telephone (Dr. Christopher Davis, Dr. Mark Israel, Kevin Durkin and Donald Vinciguerra) and another attorney (Curtis Renner). They went to this extent to try to squash my efforts to keep my analog meter just so that they can force me to accept a smart meter. I look at the much bigger picture, especially when forty other states allow some type of an opt out or meter choice. Most people can detect that there is something very wrong with this picture when researching the history of Act 129, the true intentions, the misinterpretation and then the current debacle that we are all presented with.

Exception No. 1: The ALJ erred in the Introduction: "The complaint will be dismissed for failure to prove by a preponderance of evidence that the installation of the smart meter constitutes unsafe or unreasonable service under 66 PA § 1501 or that the company violated any other provision of the Public Utility Code, Commission order or regulation or a Commission-approved tariff of the company". Upon information and belief all smart meter complaints are dismissed no matter how much evidence is submitted so that proves that the system is totally rigged against the complainant in the first place. I base this allegation upon researching many other smart meter complaints and the sheer volume of verified evidence that they provided which was totally overwhelming yet all of their cases were dismissed using one excuse or another.

Exception No. 2: #20-36, Pages 5-7 – The ALJ erred by accepting the testimony, written statements and exhibits from Christopher Davis, PhD. I objected to the entering into the record any testimony, written

statements or exhibits from Christopher Davis due to all of his research results being biased. He only reports on what supports his viewpoint. His credibility is reduced to zero because during the hearing he agreed with PPL counsel Curtis Renner that he also remembered that Mr. Hess stated in the discovery response that he wraps his cell phone in tin foil. I was humiliated by the so-called expert witness and attorney who were less than professional in their false accusations against me. Mr. Renner asked if Dr. Davis remembered reading in Mr. Hess's discovery response that he wraps his cell phone in tin foil and he replied yes. Somehow, they are remembering and discussing something that was baseless and non-existent. I never said that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. (Discovery response attached) One would have to question what else did these two individuals present that cannot be trusted.

This was a gross misrepresentation of a pro se complainant who had so much against him already in the area of health, stress, headaches, etc. These accusations of Mr. Renner and Dr. Davis were truly unprofessional as they presented such utter non-sense that was not even in my discovery response as they wasted everyone's time. Normally everyone is conditioned to believe an expert witness and an attorney as they should know what they are talking about? No, this case is totally different as they did not know what they were talking about and cannot be trusted.

The truth is that I did not say that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. They lied to the court while having no proof of their allegations. Just imagine how those remarks made me feel listening in shock as they kept on discussing this utter rubbish as if it were true. I replied to this stupidity: "If I said it, I do not do it now, if I said it". In my weakened health condition sitting there in that atmosphere like Daniel in the Lion's Den I knew that it sounded odd as I have never wrapped my cell in tin foil. Well it happened to be a flat out lie by attorney Renner and Dr. Davis agreed with him. Somehow they remembered something that did not exist.

The expert witness testimony of Dr. Davis and all of Curtis Renner's involvement in this matter should be dismissed in its entirety since they cannot come up with any discovery response that states that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. I believe that everyone sat there in shock convinced that their made-up story was correct about the tin foil cell phone story but now we see through this whole sham. Who would question the stories of an attorney and an expert witness? Again, all of their exhibits and testimony should be dismissed due to such baseless allegations against the complainant, the underdog.

While Dr. Davis may be a PhD and a full-time professor I would not trust anything that he presents. He blew it; just how much other rubbish did he present to the court in his written testimony? It does not matter how much research he did if he only reports on the findings in his favor. That is labeled as biased reporting. The ALJ accepted this rubbish that he presented as fact and ruled against me.

My cell phone is not the issue at hand. It is the harmful and unhealthy frequencies emanating from all smart meters. My cell phone usage has nothing to do with the proposed smart meter installation on my house. I never hold the cell phone to my head plus I can choose when to use it. Unlike the smart meter which is sending out radio frequency signals throughout the day. My cell phone is not a weapon that is forced upon me to have in my possession or even use. I can use it safely, when I need to and how long I

need to, unlike the proposed unconstitutional forced installation of a smart meter on my house which would be completely out of my control as I cannot turn off the radio frequency part.

Exception No. 3: #37 - 48, Pages 7-9 – The ALJ erred in accepting any testimony, written statement or exhibits from Dr. Israel because he cannot be trusted to present an honest presentation in this area. He is clueless on how my body reacts to radio frequency fields and is just ignoring all of the opposing research surrounding radio frequency fields. What good is all of his background and studies if he cannot recognize basic health issues surrounding smart meters as confirmed by the sheer volume of studies confirming the dangers? His research is totally biased as he has ignored the 1,000's of studies that are contrary to what he is presenting. I objected to any testimony, written statements or exhibits from Dr. Israel to be entered into the record due to the fact of it all being biased.

Exception No. 4: Disposition, Page 13 - The ALJ erred in not acknowledging and defending Act 129 which is an opt in law where you have to request a meter if you wanted one. The ALJ does not support the true intent of Act 129 which was clearly an opt in law. Complainant clearly desires to not opt in as stated in the Formal Complaint: "I want the PUC to order PPL Electric Utilities to leave my analog meter in place and not replace it with a "Smart Meter" as it will be detrimental to my health". Act 129 of 2008 was clearly an opt in law so why am I not allowed to chose to not opt in?

Exception No. 5: Health and Safety Concerns/Disposition, Page 16 and 17. The ALJ erred in using the flawed and biased research of Mark Israel and Christopher Davis. They may sound credible but when you search and see what they are doing, their credibility goes to zero. (See the Mary Paul v. PECO Energy Company, Petition for Reconsideration, Docket No. C-2015-2475355) This is why I objected to entering the evidence of Dr. Israel and Dr. Davis into the record. These two are no more than like paid actors only reporting part of the available extensive research in the area of radio frequency fields. There is no way for them to know how I am personally affected by radio frequencies.

Respondent has failed to meet the burden to prove that there will be no immediate or long-term effects to the complainant if a smart meter is installed on his house. Like I stated at the hearing: There are no long-term studies that I am aware of that indicate that any smart meters are safe. Maybe this smart meter weapon will not affect the average customer. The question is how can a law be enforced that is causing injury to customers whether immediately or long term? By speaking with various victims, I

believe that many more are affected but do not know the true cause of their health issues. Just how can this type of treatment be supported in Pennsylvania when approx. 40 states allow some kind of opt out, meter choice or safety provisions? ALJ Barnes erred by basing a decision on the findings of Dr. Israel and Dr. Davis. I objected to the testimonies and evidence from both of them due to it all being biased.

There was the shaking of the head, eye contact and secret communication between the utility attorney who was present and the PUC ALJ. These are some of the actions that took place that prevented me from having a fair hearing and thereby receiving a negative decision. This clear and evident collusion was witnessed by four visitors in the courtroom. I objected to all of the exhibits being put into the record of the so-called expert witnesses Israel and Davis because of the blatant biased evidence.

All of their oral arguments, written testimonies and exhibits should be dismissed because they are totally biased. They refused to include all of the studies about EMF's especially those that prove that EMF's are unhealthy and dangerous especially in the long term exposure. How can these expert witnesses ignore all of the verified facts and case studies that prove such radio frequencies are harmful? Approx. 40 states recognize that there is a problem with smart meters and allow some kind of an opt-out to their alert and concerned citizens. Just recently the city of Independence, MO outlawed smart meters.

Exception No. 6: Page 18-19 - The ALJ erred in accepting as an expert witness Christopher Davis who collaborated with Curtis Renner to destroy my credibility.

I was shocked by Mr. Renner and the expert witnesses Dr. Davis who were less than professional. Mr. Renner asked if Dr. Davis remembered reading in my discovery response that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil and he said that he did. Somehow, they are remembering and discussing something that was baseless and non-existing. I never said that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. All of their exhibits and testimony should be dismissed due to such baseless allegations against me.

That was a flat out lie by an expert witness and an attorney. They remembered something that did not exist. The truth is that I did not say that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. They lied to the court that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. I felt much better when I finally discovered that they are just like highly paid actors with no credible background and only reporting on certain select studies.

I sat there and listened to an attorney collaborating with a paid expert witness while they humbled me and lied about me saying that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. Somehow, they remembered reading it in my discovery responses. What else did they remember reading that does not exist? The attorney and the expert witness should be removed from my case as they are not credible no matter how they portray themselves as professionals.

Do they do things like this so much that it becomes common and they believe that they can get away with anything? I was lied about; put down, disrespected, became a victim of collusion involving an attorney and an expert witness and then I was ruled against. Maybe most people would accept this as normal; I do not in the least.

The expert witness testimony of Dr. Davis and all of Mr. Renner's involvement in this matter should be dismissed in its entirety since they cannot come up with any discovery response that states that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. What else was total rubbish coming from these two? Nothing of what they presented should hold any weight in this case as they both proved right there that they are unethical, unprofessional and are not trustworthy.

The ALJ erred by taking everything that they said as fact and ruled against me.

Exception No. 7: Page 20, Second and Third paragraph – The ALJ erred when bringing up my cell phone usage as my cell phone is not the issue at hand. Neither are the television towers the issue that I am complaining about. It is the harmful and unhealthy frequencies emanating from the smart meters that are of great concern. First of all, my cell phone usage has absolutely nothing to do with the proposed smart meter installation on my house. I never hold my cell phone to my head plus I can choose when to use it. Unlike the smart meter which is sending out radio frequency signals throughout the day. My cell phone is not a weapon like a smart meter that is forced upon me to have in my possession or even use. I can use my cell phone safely, when necessary, when I need to and how long I need to, unlike the proposed forced installation of a smart meter on my house which would be completely out of my control as I cannot turn off the wireless part. I feel much better since I have turned off all WIFI at my house.

Exception No. 8: Page 21, Conclusion - The ALJ erred by dismissing my complaint for failure to prove that the installation of a smart meter is unsafe or unreasonable and that no code or tariff was violated. To date all complaints are dismissed no matter what is proven as fact. The evidence of gross misconduct and collusion between the ALJ, expert witnesses and the attorneys was beyond comprehension and was unfair in every aspect no matter how much evidence I got to present. I felt discriminated against by the way I was treated during this whole complaint process. Just how can my simple little presentation be considered hearsay? I am the one that has to suffer.

The ALJ accepted all of their biased information as facts and based a decision on such. What else is not true, half true or unethical that I missed? Everything was decided in favor of the Respondent by using all of the biased information which according to research would have most likely happened even if I had

the time and energy to produce a ton of evidence as the cards are already stacked against the complainant.

The ALJ erred by fully accepting all of the evidence and testimony of the expert witnesses. During the testimony and dialog of Mr. Renner and Dr. Davis they both testified that they remembered that I stated in the discovery process that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. That was a blatant lie and they wasted court time, court reporter time and complainant's time discussing such utter nonsense. They did not read the discovery response because it does not say anywhere that I wrap my cell phone in tin foil. All of their exhibits and testimony should be excluded and the ALJ decision should be reversed.

The decision should be in total favor of the complainant because of all of the issues of misconduct by the ALJ, attorneys and the paid expert witnesses.

It appears like the ALJ had already made up her mind to rule against me by using Dr. Davis and Dr. Israel's testimonies as part of the justification for the ruling. All the presentations of Dr. Davis and Dr. Israel should be given absolutely no consideration in my case. The illegal collusion and bias against me by the ALJ and the PPL attorney with their so-called expert witnesses should be taken into serious consideration. The decision was based on biased reporting, half truths and lies about the complainant wrapping his cell phone in tin foil. The decision of the ALJ should be reversed, granting me my requested relief to keep my analog meter in place.

The ALJ erred by accepting as evidence biased reports into the record from untrustworthy expert witnesses and attorneys with their actions in question who have ignored reports that are exposing the truth of the dangers of EMF's.

Even in my weakened state of health, stress and inexperience at the hearing on May 14, 2019, I detected that something was wrong but I could not put my finger on it. Later on, I discerned that the system is rigged against me especially when I remembered attorney Mr. Ryan directing the ALJ by shaking his head and using facial expressions.

At one point I could not concentrate or focus due to my nerves and could not think to rephrase a question as requested. At this point Mr. Ryan shook his head and directed the ALJ. I observed other similar actions between the PPL attorney and the ALJ in their secret communications using facial expressions and head shakes.

It is in my opinion by observation that there was judicial mis-conduct by the ALJ who erred in the first three listings of the Code of ethics, General rule as listed below:

19. Code of ethics.

(a) General rule.--Each commissioner and each administrative law judge shall conform to the following code of ethics for the Public Utility Commission. A commissioner and an administrative law judge must:

- (1) Avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities.
- (2) Perform all duties impartially and diligently.
- (3) Avoid all ex parte communications prohibited in this part.

Title 66

**CHAPTER 3
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Subchapter

- A. General Provisions
- B. Investigations and Hearings

Enactment. Chapter 3 was added July 1, 1978, P.L.598, No.116, effective in 60 days.

Special Provisions in Appendix. See sections 14 and 15 of Act 114 of 1986 in the appendix to this title for special provisions relating to reestablishment and termination of commission.

Cross References. Chapter 3 is referred to in sections 515, 2603 of this title.

**SUBCHAPTER A
GENERAL PROVISIONS**

Sec.

301. Establishment, members, qualifications and chairman.
302. Removal of commissioner.
303. Seal.
304. Administrative law judges.
305. Director of operations, secretary, employees and consultants.
306. Office of Trial Staff (Repealed).
307. Inspectors for enforcement.
308. Bureaus and offices.
- 308.1. Consumer protection and information.
- 308.2. Other bureaus, offices and positions.
309. Oaths and subpoenas.
310. Depositions.
311. Witness fees.
312. Privilege and immunity.
313. Joint hearings and investigations; reciprocity.
314. Investigation of interstate rates, facilities and service.
315. Burden of proof.
316. Effect of commission action.
317. Fees for services rendered by commission.
318. Commission to cooperate with other departments.
319. Code of ethics.
320. Annual appropriations.
321. Annual reports.

319. Code of ethics.

(a) General rule.—Each commissioner and each administrative law judge shall conform to the following code of ethics for the Public Utility Commission. A commissioner and an administrative law judge must:

- (1) Avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities.
- (2) Perform all duties impartially and diligently.
- (3) Avoid all ex parte communications prohibited in this part.
- (4) Abstain publicly from expressing, other than in executive or public session, his personal views on the merits of a matter pending before the commission and require similar abstention on the part of commission personnel subject to his direction and control.
- (5) Require staff and personnel subject to his direction to observe the standards of fidelity and diligence that apply to the commissioner and administrative law judge.
- (6) Initiate appropriate disciplinary measures against commission personnel for unprofessional conduct.
- (7) Disqualify himself from proceedings in which his impartiality might be reasonably questioned.
- (8) Inform himself about his personal and fiduciary interests and make a reasonable effort to inform himself about the personal financial interests of his spouse and children.
- (9) Regulate his extra-curricular activities to minimize the risk of conflict with his official duties. He may speak, write or lecture and any reimbursed expenses, honorariums, royalties, or other moneys received in connection therewith shall be disclosed annually. Such disclosure statement shall be filed with the secretary of the commission and shall be open to inspection by the public during the normal business hours of the commission during the tenure of the commissioner or of the administrative law judge.
- (10) Refrain from solicitation of funds for any political, educational, religious, charitable, fraternal or civic purposes, although he may be an officer, director or trustee of such organizations.
- (11) Refrain from financial or business dealing which would tend to reflect adversely on impartiality, although the commissioner or administrative law judge may hold and manage investments which are not incompatible with the duties of his office.
- (12) Conform to such additional rules as the commission may prescribe.

(b) Removal of commissioner for violation.—Any commissioner who violates the provisions of subsection (a) shall be removed from office in the manner provided in section 302 (relating to removal of commissioner).

(c) Removal of judge for violation.—Any administrative law judge who violates the provisions of subsection (a) shall be removed from office in the manner provided by the act of August 5, 1941 (P.L.752, No.286), known as the "Civil Service Act."

Exception No. 09: Page 22, #2, Page 24, #13 - The ALJ erred concerning that there is no provision for customers to opt.out. That is not the issue at hand. I am not asking to opt in as Act 129 provides. I do not want to opt in. You need to request a smart meter. I never requested a smart meter.

Conclusion

My understanding by observation at my Hearing in Hearing Room 2 of the Keystone Building at 400 North Street in Harrisburg, PA on May 14, 2019 from 10:00am to 11:00am is as follows:

1. It is confirmed that I had an unfair hearing. There was evident collusion between the ALJ and PPL Attorney.
2. I was clearly a victim of discrimination, collusion and the most blatant wrongdoings.
3. Discrimination is the fact that I could not afford an attorney and expert witnesses therefore it puts me at a great disadvantage. I could not afford any expert witnesses so I should not have had to face any on the side of Respondent. It is totally unfair to put the residents of Pennsylvania in this situation (who cannot afford to fight) because of a law that clearly states "upon request" is being interpreted as enforcement.
4. There were the false accusations by Mr. Renner and Dr. Davis on complainant stating that he wraps his cell phone in tin foil.
5. The ALJ erred in not showing fairness to both sides.

To date no one was successful at the PUC level no matter what they presented with verified proof or any expert witness testimony. The question would be whether the PA PUC has jurisdiction to rule, decide and interpret Act 129 in the way it is doing so. Perhaps it is in the negative and we are just wasting time.

There is definitely collusion between the PA PUC and PPL against the customers who will be harmed by smart meters and it was evident in the courtroom. I truly feel that I was not given due process. The bias and unlawful collusion between the ALJ and PPL attorney shows exactly why this is so.

This decision should be reversed due to it being based on flawed studies, biased reporting and the fact that the complainant became a victim of collusion between the PPL attorneys, expert witnesses and the ALJ.

All this took place in Courtroom 2 of the Keystone Building at 400 North Street, Harrisburg, PA on May 14, 2019 from 10:00am – 11:00am. There were several observers in the courtroom that day. They must have been shocked as they witnessed this whole drama.

It seems that everything is blamed on Act 129 but the interpretation is altered from the original intent where it stated "upon request". The customer has to request a smart meter.

Although I may not be able to put into the proper words concerning the magnitude of what has happened at the hearing and everything else surrounding this case but I clearly understand what others have endured in their struggle by fighting for their rights and safety. (See the John Kline v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Exceptions, Docket No. C-2017-2621072)

The issue of smart meter deployment is far more serious than lead in the gasoline, lead in the paint, the tobacco issue and cigarette smoke. I believe that every single state that has offered some type of relief has considered safety and health issues of their smart meters in their decisions.

It is hard for some to believe that our rights to remain safe in our homes in Pennsylvania are in jeopardy while the laws of the United States of America are ignored or potentially violated. I believe that the deployment and forced placement of smart meters on all homes in PA is unconstitutional and against what our founding fathers had in mind.

Isaiah 54:17a King James Version (KJV)

¹⁷ No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper;

Luke 8:17 King James Version (KJV)

¹⁷ For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest; neither any thing hid, that shall not be known and come abroad.

1 Peter 1:25 King James Version (KJV)


²⁵ But the word of the Lord endureth for ever.

RECEIVED

JUL 8 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson Hess

2408 Crow Foot Drive

Auburn, PA 17922

Dated: July 08, 2019

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document upon the parties, listed below, in accordance with the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by a party).

Devin Ryan
Post & Schell
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601

RECEIVED

JUL 8 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Signed:



Nelson Hess

Dated this 8th day of July, 2019

RECEIVED

JUL 8 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Nelson Hess v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

Docket No. C-2018-3003337

INTERROGATORIES

1-1

Re: Formal Complaint.

- (a) I am challenging the PPL's installation of the new smart meter due to my extreme sensitivity to the radio frequencies that they emit, it's an unconstitutional surveillance device and that my personal data will be sold. Due to my protection procedures, my house is currently within safe levels of radiation without a smart meter installed. The installation of a smart meter would be bombarding me with unhealthy radiation that would be outside of my control. I could also not control the surveillance aspect or the sale of my personal data. And then there is the safety aspect which would be outside of my control.**
- (b) My health concerns are the short term and the long term effects of being bombarded by these unhealthy frequencies even while I am sleeping. The basis for this claim is that there is no long term study that proves that the new Smart Meters are not detrimental to my health.**
- (c) My safety concern for PPL's new smart meter is the chance of fire or damage to my appliances, property, etc. Various fires were caused by these new smart meters but get fixed quickly and the news does not get to (or will not) report on them.**
- (d) My privacy concerns are the chance that PPL's new meters could be easily hacked. Read the news about the many hacking situations that are being reported and many go unreported. Also my personal data is not to be sold without my permission.**
- (e) The new smart meters of PPL violates the law (Act 129) if forced upon a consumer. Act 129 was intended to be an opt-in to those who want or request a new smart meter.**

1-2

There are no wireless telephones in my house.

There is one cell phone that is protected with three different technologies including tin foil on the holder to help block the incoming signal. I put it on airplane mode a lot. I always use the speaker phone or text. I never hold it close to my head or near my ear and had not in the past due to being so sensitive to the frequencies which cause me very bad headaches and blurred vision.

There is one microwave oven that is built into the kitchen which I have never used and is unplugged.

I have one router with the wifi turned off. If I need to use the wifi momentarily I wrap it in four layers of thick foil from an emergency tent and put shungite on it, etc. to block 95 percent of unhealthy frequencies.

I have no wifi networks.

I have two computers that are hard wired and are tested for any unhealthy frequencies.

I have one Bluetooth speaker and again used very little but heavily protected.

I have no wireless security monitors.

I do not and would not have any smart speakers such as Alexia, Amazon Echo, etc.

I have a garage door opener which is a very low frequency transmission.

I have no baby monitors.

I have no walkie talkie in or used in my house.

1-3

There is one cell phone (a Samsung Galaxie 8+) that is protected (and tested) with three different technologies including tin foil on the holder. I always use the speaker phone or text, never hold it to my ear and never had in the past due to being so sensitive to the frequencies which cause me very bad headaches and blurred vision.

1-4

- (a) A new smart meter will cause severe headaches, tightness in my chest, concentration issues, central nervous issues, etc...
- (b) My health conditions began 10-15 years ago with the advent of easy-pass, wifi while shopping, dining out, visiting and lodging. Most recently while visiting my sister after the installation of a Smart Meter.
- (c) It is impossible to document such conditions while in a doctor's office when you are away from the sources of EMF. I had to take a wifi-enabled bus recently and suffered greatly. I did not have my doctor with me to evaluate the situation.
- (d) See Dr. Brzozowski report.
- (e) See Dr. Brzozowski report that is clearly against the installation of a smart meter. By taking medication would only cause side effects such as more headaches, dizzy and nausea and would not be fixing the problem. I cannot take many medications due the side effects.

1-5

(a) No known witness at this time.

(b) No acquired witness.

(c) No witness.

1-6

(a) No witness.

(b) No witness.

(c) No witness.

(d) No witness.

1-7

No exhibits are known at this time.

Nelson Hess
2408 Crow Foot Dr.
Auburn, PA 17922



Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-3265