



17 North Second Street
12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
717-731-1970 Main
717-731-1985 Main Fax
www.postschell.com

Devin Ryan

dryan@postschell.com
717-612-6052 Direct
717-731-1981 Direct Fax
File #: 167945

October 9, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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: Christie Brzostowski v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation
Docket No. C-2019-3009320

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing is the Motion of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation to Compel Responses to Discovery Propounded on Christie Brzostowski – Set I in the above-referenced proceeding. Copies will be provided as indicated on the Certificate of Service.

Respectfully submitted,



Devin Ryan

DTR/dmc
Enclosure

cc: Honorable Elizabeth Barnes (*w/enclosure*)
Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following persons, in the manner indicated, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Christie Brzostowski
1 East Avenue
Mt. Carmel, PA 17851

Date: October 9, 2019



Devin T. Ryan

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Christie Brzostowski,	:	
	:	
Complainant,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2019-3009320
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

NOTICE TO PLEAD

YOU ARE HEREBY ADVISED THAT, PURSUANT TO 52 PA. CODE § 5.342(g)(1), YOU MAY FILE A REPLY TO THE ENCLOSED MOTION TO COMPEL WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF SERVICE. YOUR REPLY SHOULD BE FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION, P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265. A COPY OF YOUR REPLY SHOULD ALSO BE SERVED ON THE UNDERSIGNED COUNSEL.

Kimberly A. Klock (ID # 89716)
Michael J. Shafer (ID # 205681)
PPL Services Corporation
Two North Ninth Street
Allentown, PA 18101
Phone: 610-774-2599
Fax: 610-774-4102
E-mail: kklock@pplweb.com
mjshafer@pplweb.com



Devin T. Ryan (ID # 316602)
Garrett P. Lent (ID # 321566)
Lindsay A. Berkstresser (ID # 318370)
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
Phone: 717-731-1970
Fax: 717-731-1985
E-mail: dryan@postschell.com
glent@postschell.com
lberkstresser@postschell.com

Curtis S. Renner (ID # 326488)
Watson & Renner
1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 1005 - ENS
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-737-6302
E-mail: crenner@w-r.com

Date: October 9, 2019

Attorneys for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Christie Brzostowski,	:	
	:	
Complainant,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2019-3009320
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

**MOTION OF PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION TO
COMPEL RESPONSES TO
DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED ON CHRISTIE BRZOSTOWSKI – SET I**

TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ELIZABETH H. BARNES:

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.342(g) and 5.349(d), PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (“PPL Electric” or the “Company”) hereby files this Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery Propounded on Christie Brzostowski (“Complainant”) – Set I. In support of its Motion, PPL Electric states as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On August 7, 2019, PPL Electric served Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents on the Complainant – Set I (“PPL to Complainant Set I”) via regular mail. A true and correct copy of PPL to Complainant Set I is attached hereto and marked as **Appendix A.**

2. Pursuant to the Commission's regulations, objections to PPL to Complainant Set I were due on or before August 20, 2019, and responses were due on or before August 30, 2019.¹

3. On August 17, 2019, the Complainant sent an email to counsel for PPL Electric, requesting a 40-day extension to respond to PPL to Complainant Set I.

4. Later on August 17, 2019, counsel for PPL Electric sent an email to the Complainant stating that PPL Electric would agree to a 14-day extension for the Complainant to respond to PPL to Complainant Set I. This would extend the deadline for the Complainant to respond to PPL to Complainant Set I until September 13, 2019.

5. The Complainant never served any objections to PPL to Complainant Set I by August 20, 2019.

6. On August 27, 2019, the Complainant sent counsel for PPL Electric an email requesting more than 14 days to provide her answers to PPL to Complainant Set I.

7. Subsequently on August 27, 2019, counsel for PPL Electric responded to the Complainant's email, stating again that PPL Electric only was willing to grant a 14-day extension for Complainant to respond to PPL to Complainant Set I.

8. The Complainant never served answers to PPL to Complainant Set I by September 13, 2019.

9. On September 17, 2019, the Complainant informally sent an email to PPL Electric's counsel containing incomplete responses to PPL to Complainant Set I. A true and correct copy of the Complainant's informal responses to PPL to Complainant Set I is attached hereto and marked as **Appendix B**.

¹ Because the discovery requests were served by first class mail, three days were added to the prescribed due dates for answers and objections. *See* 52 Pa. Code § 1.56(b).

10. The Complainant failed to provide complete responses to Complainant Set I, Questions 2 through 4 and failed to provide any responses to Questions 1 and 5 through 7.

11. Pursuant to the Prehearing Order dated May 17, 2019, the Complainant was required to serve any statements, reports, and direct testimony of any expert witness she intends to call on or before September 6, 2019.

12. The Complainant has not served any statements, reports, and direct testimony of any expert witness on PPL Electric to date.

13. The Company served its direct testimony and exhibits in this case on October 7, 2019, as required by the Prehearing Order.

14. Effectively, the Complainant has had approximately two months to provide her answers to PPL to Complainant Set I, which were served on August 7, 2019.

15. To date, no formal, complete responses to PPL to Complainant Set I have been received.

II. MOTION TO COMPEL

16. PPL Electric respectfully requests that the Administrative Law Judge Elizabeth H. Barnes (the “ALJ”) direct the Complainant to answer fully all of the interrogatories set forth in PPL to Complainant Set I.

17. Under 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c), a party is entitled to obtain discovery of any matter not privileged that is relevant to the pending proceeding, or any matter that is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Discovery is permitted regardless of whether the information sought “relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to the claim or defense of another party.” *Id.*

18. Answers to interrogatories are due within 20 days of the service date. 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(d).

19. Here, PPL Electric served its first set of interrogatories on August 7, 2019. Consequently, answers to PPL to Complainant Set I were due on or before August 30, 2019.

20. PPL Electric, however, agreed to extend the due date for the Complainant's responses to PPL to Complainant Set I by 14 days, making the new deadline September 13, 2019.

21. Yet, the Company still has not received formal and complete answers to PPL to Complainant Set I.

22. Indeed, the Complainant provided informal (but incomplete) responses to Questions 1 through 4 and absolutely no responses to Questions 5 through 7.

23. As it is now October 9, 2019, the responses are now well past due.

24. Further, the Complainant never objected to any of the questions in PPL to Complainant Set I.

25. Therefore, the Complainant has waived the right to object to these interrogatories and must provide answers to them. *See* 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.342(a)(4) (stating that a party must “[a]nswer each interrogatory fully and completely unless an objection is made”).

26. In addition, the interrogatories propounded by PPL Electric are highly relevant to the issues to be decided in this case, including the Complainant's claim that the new automated meter infrastructure (“AMI”) meter will cause, contribute to, or exacerbate adverse health effects.

A. PPL TO COMPLAINANT-I-1

27. Question 1 simply asks the Complainant to detail the reasons why she is challenging the AMI meter's installation and to identify, among other things, all health, safety,

and privacy concerns he has with the new AMI meter. To the extent Complainant is making claims that installation of the AMI meter will cause or contribute to a medical condition, her medical records are important information for the Company's medical expert witness to review.

28. These basic, foundational questions are critical to knowing what issues the Complainant will be raising at the evidentiary hearing. Without an answer, PPL Electric and its witnesses would not be fully prepared to respond to all of the Complainant's issues at the hearing.

29. The Complainant has not provided any formal or informal response to this interrogatory and should be compelled to respond.

B. PPL TO COMPLAINANT-I-2

30. In Question 2, PPL Electric has asked that the Complainant identify all wireless phones, cellphones, microwaves, wireless routers, wifi networks, tablets, computers, Bluetooth speakers, wireless security systems, smart speakers (*e.g.*, Amazon Echo), garage door openers, baby monitors, and walkie talks that are contained in or used in the house.

31. This inquiry is relevant to whether the Complainant exposes herself to technology that emits higher levels of radio frequency ("RF") fields than the new AMI meter.

32. The Complainant has provided some information about the electrical equipment and cellphones used in her house, stating in her email that they have iPhones, an iPad, and laptop computers. *See Appendix B.*

33. However, the Complainant does not state with specificity as to the make and model of each of these devices.

34. PPL Electric is entitled to show how the RF exposures from the Complainant's devices and appliances, compare to those from the AMI meter.

35. Therefore, the Complainant should be compelled to identify these devices as requested.

C. PPL TO COMPLAINANT-I-3

36. In Question 3, the Company has requested information regarding the Complainant's cell phone usage and records of such usage.

37. Using this information, PPL Electric could calculate the amount of the Complainant's RF exposure from her cell phone and compare it to the lower amount of RF exposure from the new AMI meter. The level of RF exposure that Complainant already is getting from her cell phone can be calculated based on the minutes of Complainant's cell phone use, which typically are provided on each month's cell phone bill.

38. In fact, as the testimony of PPL Electric's expert witness on RF exposures – Dr. Christopher Davis – will demonstrate, the RF exposures received from use of a cell phone (or even standing within 30 feet of another person using a cell phone) and other devices are far higher than from an AMI meter.

39. The Complainant states in her informal response that she would “have to request” cellphone bills “with a list of calls etc.” Appendix B.

40. Without details on the number and length of the calls, PPL Electric's expert witness cannot calculate the precise amount of RF exposures from the cellphones.

41. PPL Electric is entitled to show how the RF exposures from the Complainant's devices and appliances, including any cell phones, compare to those from the AMI meter.

42. Thus, the Complainant should be compelled to provide the cellphone bills as requested.

D. PPL TO COMPLAINANT-I-4

43. In Question 4, PPL Electric has asked the Complainant to identify health conditions she alleges will be caused or worsened by the installation of the AMI meter and to provide any medical records of those alleged conditions.

44. This is especially relevant because it appears that the Complainant will allege that the AMI meter will cause, contribute to, or exacerbate adverse health effects.

45. In her informal response, the Complainant mentions migraines and provides some information about doctors who diagnosed them. *See* Appendix B.

46. However, the Complainant provides absolutely no medical records about these alleged health conditions.

47. Unless the Company is provided with such records, PPL Electric's medical expert cannot review them and fully respond to the Complainant's allegations.

48. As a result, the Complainant should be compelled to provide a full and complete response to this interrogatory.

E. PPL TO COMPLAINANT-I-5 THROUGH 7

49. In Questions 5 through 7, PPL Electric has asked for basic information about the Complainant's case, including that she identify any lay witnesses and expert witnesses she plans to call to testify and that she provide copies of his proposed exhibits.

50. PPL Electric must know in advance of the hearing who will be testifying on behalf of the Complainant, if anyone, and the subject areas of their testimony.

51. Otherwise, PPL Electric would be denied due process. *See Schneider v. Pa. PUC*, 479 A.2d 10, 15 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984) (citation omitted) (stating that due process is satisfied when a party is "afforded notice and the opportunity to appear and be heard"); 66 Pa. C.S. § 332(c) (providing that "[e]very party is entitled to present his case or defense by oral or documentary

evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts”).

52. Further, as mentioned previously, the Complainant’s exhibits and expert testimony were due to be served on September 6, 2019, the Company’s testimony and exhibits were served on October 7, 2019, all exhibits and testimony must be received by the ALJ no later than November 1, 2019, and the evidentiary hearing is scheduled for November 7, 2019.

53. To date, the Complainant has not served any exhibits or expert testimony.

54. Thus, with the hearing approximately one month away, PPL Electric has severely limited information about the Complainant’s issues, exhibits, and witnesses, if any, that she intends to present.

55. The Company is entitled to discovery of such basic and relevant information and documents, and the Complainant should be compelled to respond.

F. RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO SUPPLEMENT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

56. The evidentiary hearing is currently scheduled for November 7, 2019, and all exhibits and testimony must be received by the ALJ no later than November 1, 2019.

57. Therefore, PPL Electric is filing this Motion to Compel to try to receive answers to the discovery in sufficient time before the evidentiary hearing.

58. In addition, on October 7, 2019, PPL Electric served the statements, reports, written testimony, and exhibits it intends to present at the hearing.

59. PPL Electric reserves the right to supplement or revise any of its exhibits, reports, and statements, to the extent that the Complainant serves any of these discovery responses.

60. For these reasons, PPL Electric respectfully requests that the ALJ grant its Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery.

III. SANCTIONS

61. Upon the motion of a party, the presiding officer may make an appropriate order for sanctions if a party fails to answer or otherwise respond to a discovery request or refuses to obey an order of the presiding officer respecting discovery. *See* 52 Pa. Code § 5.371(a).

62. In ruling upon a motion for sanctions, the presiding officer may, among other things, issue: (1) “[a]n order that the matters regarding which the questions were asked, the character or description of the thing or land, the contents of the paper, or other designated fact shall be taken to be established for the purposes of the action in accordance with the claim of the party obtaining the order”; (2) [a]n order refusing to allow the disobedient party to support or oppose designated claims or defenses, or prohibiting the party from introducing in evidence designated documents, things or testimony”; and (3) “[a]n order striking out pleadings or parts thereof, staying further proceedings until the order is obeyed, or entering a judgment against the disobedient party or individual advising the disobedience.” *Id.* § 5.372(a)(1)-(3).

63. If the Complainant fails to provide full and complete responses to PPL Electric’s discovery requests in sufficient time before the November 7, 2019 hearing, PPL Electric will be deprived of a reasonable opportunity to prepare for the hearing and respond to the Complainant’s claims.

64. Accordingly, the Company respectfully requests that if the Complainant fails to produce the information and documents related to any of her claims by October 17, 2019, then the Complainant should be barred from litigating the corresponding claim(s).

65. For example, if the Complainant fails to produce her medical records to verify the existence of any claimed medical conditions or issues, then the Complainant would be precluded

from litigating claims that the installation of PPL Electric's AMI meter would cause, contribute to, or exacerbate adverse health effects.

66. Similarly, if the Complainant fails to produce information about her current exposure to RF fields as requested in Questions 2 and 3, including but not limited to bills showing the extent of her cell phone use, then the Complainant would be precluded from litigating claims that PPL Electric's AMI meter would expose her to unreasonable levels of RF fields.

67. Finally, to the extent that this Motion is granted and the Complainant fails to answer fully PPL to Complainant Set I, or otherwise comply with the ALJ's order, PPL Electric intends to file an appropriate motion pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.371(a) and 5.372(a) to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice.

68. The Commission has regularly dismissed AMI meter complaints with prejudice due to the complainants' failure to answer discovery in compliance with the presiding administrative law judge's orders granting motions to compel. *See, e.g., Carol Sojda & Carol Lutzkanin v. Metropolitan Edison Co.*, Docket No. C-2017-2638350, pp. 7-8 (Jan. 9, 2019), *adopted*, Docket No. C-2017-2638350 (Order entered Mar. 28, 2019); *Kimberly Beckmann v. Metropolitan Edison Co.*, Docket No. C-2017-2613702, pp. 7-10 (Jan. 31, 2019), *adopted*, Docket No. C-2017-2613702 (Order entered Apr. 11, 2019); *Darlene Stanton v. Pennsylvania Electric Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-3001144, pp. 6-11 (May 10, 2019), *adopted*, Docket No. C-2018-3001144 (Order entered July 11, 2019); *Diana Cook v. West Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-3003051, pp. 6-10 (May 1, 2019), *adopted*, Docket No. C-2018-3003051 (Order entered July 11, 2019); *Kyle M. Denlinger v. PPL Electric Utilities Corp.*, Docket No. C-2018-3005721, pp. 4-11 (Aug. 16, 2019), *adopted*, Docket No. C-2018-3005721 (Order entered Sept. 26, 2019).

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation respectfully requests that Administrative Law Judge Elizabeth H. Barnes grant this Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery and direct Christie Brzostowski to answer fully PPL to Complainant Set I, as described above within three (3) days from the date of the order.

Respectfully submitted,



Kimberly A. Klock (ID # 89716)
Michael J. Shafer (ID # 205681)
PPL Services Corporation
Two North Ninth Street
Allentown, PA 18101
Phone: 610-774-2599
Fax: 610-774-4102
E-mail: kklock@pplweb.com
mjshafer@pplweb.com

Devin T. Ryan (ID # 316602)
Garrett P. Lent (ID # 321566)
Lindsay A. Berkstresser (ID # 318370)
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
Phone: 717-731-1970
Fax: 717-731-1985
E-mail: dryan@postschell.com
glent@postschell.com
lberkstresser@postschell.com

Curtis S. Renner (ID # 326488)
Watson & Renner
1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 1005 - ENS
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-737-6302
E-mail: crenner@w-r.com

Date: October 9, 2019

Attorneys for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

APPENDIX A

Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by PPL Electric Utilities Corporation on Christie Brzostowski – Set I



17 North Second Street
12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
717-731-1970 Main
717-731-1985 Main Fax
www.postschell.com

Devin Ryan

dryan@postschell.com
717-612-6052 Direct
717-731-1981 Direct Fax
File #: 167945

August 7, 2019

VIA REGULAR MAIL

Christie Brzostowski
1 East Avenue
Mt. Carmel, PA 17851

Re: Christie Brzostowski v. PPL Utilities Corporation
Docket No. C-2019-3009320

Dear Ms. Brzostowski:

Enclosed are the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by PPL Electric Utilities Corporation on Christie Brzostowski – Set I in the above-referenced proceeding. Copies will be provided as indicated on the Certificate of Service.

Please provide answers to the enclosed discovery within twenty (20) days of the date of service, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.342.

Sincerely,

Devin Ryan

DTR/dmc
Enclosures

cc: Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary (*Cover Letter and COS only*)
Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following persons, in the manner indicated, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Christie Brzostowski
1 East Avenue
Mt. Carmel, PA 17851

Date: August 7, 2019



Devin T. Ryan

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Christie Brzostowski,	:	
	:	
Complainant	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2019-3009320
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation,	:	
	:	
Respondent	:	

**INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PROPOUNDED BY
PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION ON
CHRISTIE BRZOSTOWSKI – SET I**

Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 333 and 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.341 *et seq.*, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (“PPL Electric”) propounds the following Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (hereinafter, “discovery requests”) on Christie Brzostowski (“Complainant”) – Set I.

INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

1. The “Responding Party,” “you,” or “your” means the party to which these discovery requests are propounded and/or all attorneys, agents, affiliates, subsidiaries, employees, consultants, members, constituents, and representatives acting on behalf of the Responding Party.
2. “Commission” means the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.
3. To “identify” a natural person means to state that person’s full name, title or position, employer, last known address, and last known telephone number.

4. To “identify” a business entity means to state the full name of such business, the form of the business, and its location or address.

5. To “identify” a “document” means to provide all of the following information irrespective of whether the document is deemed privileged or subject to any claim of privilege:

- a. The title or other means of identification of each such document;
- b. The date of each such document;
- c. The author, preparer or signer of each such document; and
- d. A description of the subject matter of such document sufficient to permit an understanding of its contents and importance to the testimony or position being examined and the present or last known location of the document. The specific nature of the document should also be stated (*e.g.*, letter, business record, memorandum, computer print-out, etc.).

In lieu of “identifying” any document, it shall be deemed a sufficient compliance with these discovery requests to attach a copy of each such document to the answers hereto and reference said document in the particular interrogatory to which the document is responsive.

6. “Document” means the original and all drafts of all written and graphic matter, however produced or reproduced, of any kind or description, whether or not sent or received, and all copies thereof which are different in any way from the original (whether by interlineation, date-stamp, notarization, indication of copies sent or received, or otherwise), including without limitation, any paper, book, account, photograph, blueprint, drawing, sketch, schematic, agreement, contract, memorandum, press release, circular, advertising material, correspondence, letter, telegram, telex, object, report, opinion, investigation, record, transcript, hearing, meeting, study, notation, working paper, summary, intra-office communication, diary, chart, minutes, index sheet, computer software, computer-generated records or files, however stored, check, check stub, delivery ticket, bill of lading, invoice, record or recording or summary of any telephone or other conversation, or of any interview or of any conference, or

any other written, recorded, transcribed, punched, taped, filmed, or graphic matter of which the Responding Party has or has had possession, custody or control, or of which the Responding Party has knowledge.

7. “Communication” means any manner or form of information or message transmission, however produced or reproduced, whether as a document as herein defined, or orally or otherwise, which is made, distributed, or circulated between or among persons, or data storage or processing units.

8. “Date” means the exact day, month, and year, if ascertainable, or if not, the best approximation thereof.

9. Items referred to in the singular include those in the plural, and items referred to in the plural include those in the singular.

10. Items referred to in the masculine include those in the feminine, and items referred to in the feminine include those in the masculine.

11. The answers provided to these discovery requests should first restate the question asked and identify the person(s) supplying the information.

12. In answering these discovery requests, the Responding Party is requested to furnish all information that is available to the Responding Party, including information in the possession of the Responding Party’s attorneys, agents, consultants, or investigators, and not merely such information of the Responding Party’s own knowledge. If any of the discovery requests cannot be answered in full after exercising due diligence to secure the requested information, please so state and answer to the extent possible, specifying the Responding Party’s inability to answer the remainder, and stating whatever information the Responding

Party has concerning the unanswered portions. If the Responding Party's answer is qualified in any particular, please set forth the details of such qualification.

13. If the Responding Party objects to providing any document requested on any ground, identify such document by describing it as set forth in Instruction 5 and state the basis of the objection.

14. If the Responding Party objects to part of a discovery request and refuses to answer that part, state the Responding Party's objection and answer the remaining portion of that discovery request. If the Responding Party objects to the scope or time period of a discovery request and refuses to answer for that scope or time period, state the Responding Party's objection and answer the discovery request for the scope or time period that the Responding Party believes is appropriate.

15. If, in connection with a discovery request, the Responding Party contends that any information, otherwise subject to discovery, is covered by either the attorney-client privilege, the so-called "attorneys' work product doctrine," or any other privilege or doctrine, then specify the general subject matter of the information and the basis to support each such objection.

16. If any information is withheld on grounds of privilege or other protection from disclosure, provide the following information: (a) every person to whom such information has been communicated and from whom such information was learned; (b) the nature and subject matter of the information; and (c) the basis on which the privilege or other protection from disclosure is claimed.

17. As set forth in 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(g), these discovery requests are continuing, and the Responding Party is obliged to change, supplement, and correct all answers given to conform to new or changing information.

18. "Formal Complaint" means the Formal Complaint filed by the Complainant at Docket No. C-2019-3009320.

**INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PROPOUNDED ON
CHRISTIE BRZOSTOWSKI – SET I**

PPL to Complainant-I-1

Re: Formal Complaint.

- (a) Please explain in detail the reasons why you are challenging the Company's installation of the new smart meter.
- (b) Please describe in detail all health concerns, if any, raised by the Company's new smart meter, state the bases for such claims, and provide all documents relied upon by you in your response.
- (c) Please describe in detail all safety concerns, if any, raised by the Company's new smart meter, state the bases for such claims, and provide all documents relied upon by you in your response.
- (d) Please describe in detail all privacy concerns, if any, raised by the Company's new smart meter, state the bases for such claims, and provide all documents relied upon by you in your response.
- (e) Please describe in detail all reasons you believe the Company's new smart meter violates the law.

PPL to Complainant-I-2

Please identify all wireless phones, cellphones, microwaves, wireless routers, wifi networks, tablets, computers, Bluetooth speakers, wireless security systems, smart speakers (*e.g.*, Amazon Echo), garage door openers, baby monitors, and walkie talkies that are contained in or used in the house.

PPL to Complainant-I-3

Please state whether you or any member of your household uses a cell phone. If so, please provide the make and model of each cell phone and, for each phone identified, provide 12 months of phone bills or other records of actual cell phone usage.

PPL to Complainant-I-4

- (a) Please state every health condition you claim was caused by a smart meter or will be caused or worsened by the installation of PPL Electric's new smart meter.
- (b) Please provide the date that every health condition identified in subpart (a) began.

- (c) Please provide copies of all your medical records of every health condition identified in subpart (a).
- (d) For each alleged health condition that you do not have medical records for in response to subpart (c), please state whether such condition was diagnosed by a medical professional. If so, please provide the name, address, and telephone number of the medical professional and the date of the diagnosis.
- (e) For each of the alleged health conditions identified in subpart (a), please state whether you have been prescribed any therapy or treatment for the condition by a medical professional. If so, please identify the therapy or treatment, provide the name, address, and telephone number of the prescribing medical professional, and provide the date the therapy or treatment was prescribed.

PPL to Complainant-I-5

Please identify each person you plan to call as a fact witness in this proceeding. For each person, please:

- (a) Provide the person's name, home and business address, background, and qualifications;
- (b) Explain in detail the subject matter(s) on which the witness is expected to testify; and
- (c) Provide the source(s) of information relied upon or referenced by the witness.

PPL to Complainant-I-6

Please identify each person you plan to call as an expert witness in this proceeding. For each person, please:

- (a) Provide the person's name, home and business address, background, and qualifications;
- (b) Explain in detail the subject matter(s) on which the witness is expected to testify;
- (c) Provide the source(s) of information relied upon or referenced by the witness; and
- (d) Provide a copy of the expert witness's current curriculum vitae.

PPL to Complainant-I-7

Please provide copies of all exhibits you intend to present or utilize at the evidentiary hearing in this proceeding. For each exhibit to be used as part of your direct case, please identify the witness who will be sponsoring the exhibit.

APPENDIX B

Christie Brzostowski's September 17, 2019 Email Informally Responding to Portions of PPL to Complainant Set I

Ryan, Devin

From: christie beagle <christiebrz613@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2019 11:48 AM
To: Ryan, Devin
Subject: Questions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: PPL - Purple Category
FilingDate: 9/17/2019 12:17:00 PM

Mr. Ryan,

I filled out an inquiry for The institute of Justice to see if they would represent me on this matter. It stated once to allow 30 days to process request. I asked for additional days but was only offered 14. I am going to answer these questions as best as possible since you won't allow the additional days to seek legal counsel. I'm unable to interpret the legal jargon within the request letter.

1. Familial Hemiplegic Migraines (A genetic mutation)- Hershey Medical Center Dr. Wicklund and team of neurologists determined diagnosis

2. I'm not sure how to answer this Bc our son is in college for cyber security and has two computers (Mac laptop and one he built) and his cell phone that are at college. Up until age 18 we raised him without most technology. We've never had the dish, garage door opener, Bluetooth, baby monitors, etc

Our security system is hard wired

We have two Mac computers & laptop that aren't/haven't been in use for many years. One has been in a closet for at least 8-9 years unplugged. The other is in our office but hasn't been used in the same amount of time Bc it's out of memory storage and shuts down. I had a Mac laptop and the last time it was used is when I completed my last graduate degree at Widener. I don't even know where it's at. My husband has an iPad and cell phone. He has another iPad that is broken. The one he has now replaced the other. All our phones are iPhones. I believe mine is a #6. I'm not sure how to tell. I didn't realize the phone bills don't come with a list of calls etc. I have to request it.

We have a microwave. It was build into our cabinetry over 10 years ago(prior to diagnosis), otherwise I wouldn't have it in our home. I've altered my entire lifestyle around HM including not using a microwave due to reducing the nutrients in food.

Once again, I tried to answer these as best as possible without counsel.

Warmly,
Christie Brzostowski

Sent from my iPhone