

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Jeffrey Smiles	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2018-3003895
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

ERRATA

A review of the Initial Decision dated and issued on July 12, 2019 in the above-captioned proceeding, revealed a typographical error on page 17 in the third paragraph. The word “Mifflintown” is amended to state “Sinking Springs.”

In all other respects the Initial Decision remains in full force and effect in its entirety. A corrected copy of page 17 is attached for your records. Please correct your records.

Date: July 19, 2019

/s/
Elizabeth H. Barnes
Administrative Law Judge

PPL Electric Statement No. 1 at 15, PPL Electric Exhibit CD2. RF signals from the AMI meter are of very short duration and will occur for only a total of 84 seconds over a 24-hour period. PPL Electric Statement No. 1 at 7.

The RF field exposure 30 feet from a person using a cell phone are three times larger than the RF fields from the AMI meter. PPL Electric Statement No. 1 at 14, PPL Electric Exhibit CD4. RF fields from using cell phones near the head can be over 260,000 times higher than the RF fields from the AMI meter. PPL Electric Exhibit CD4. Complainant has a Tracphone cell phone that he uses for emergencies while driving. Tr. 15. Complainant is receiving radiofrequency fields at a much higher level while using his Tracphone next to his head than he would be living in a house with an RF Mesh meter attached to it on an outside wall. The World Health Organization and a number of other public health authorities have concluded that the scientific research on RF exposures from cell phone use, which are far higher than the RF from PPL's smart meters, has not shown that RF fields cause adverse health effects. PPL Electric Statement No. 2 at 10-15, PPL Electric Exhibit MI-1.

Additionally, there are eight television broadcast towers within a 50-mile radius of Complainant's location in Sinking Springs, Pennsylvania. PPL Electric Statement No. 1 at 15. Based on the locations of each tower and their RF power outputs, the constant background level of RF fields at Complainant's residence are 6.7 times higher than the RF signals from the AMI meter. PPL Electric Statement No. 1 at 15, PPL Electric Exhibit CD-5. Thus, given the background RF exposure to the service property compared to the minimal RF exposure from the AMI meter, I am not persuaded to conclude the AMI meter will cause a deleterious health effect to Complainant. This holding is consistent with recent caselaw precedent including: *Hoffman-Lorah supra.*; *Sunstein Murphy v. PECO Energy Company*, C-2015-2475726 (Opinion and Order entered May 9, 2019); *Benhayon v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation*, C-2018-3003491 (Final Order entered April 29, 2019, adopting Initial Decision issued March 25, 2019) and *Lesniewski v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation*, C-2018-3004594 (Final Order entered April 29, 2019, adopting Initial Decision issued March 25, 2019).