

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Ethan Habrial :
:
v. : C-2018-3005907
:
Metropolitan Edison Company :

EXCEPTIONS OF ETHAN HABRIAL

The following reasons are why I should be exempt from a smart meter and the problems with MetEd's case for a smart meter.

1. Page 4 line 5. John Ahr a paid employee of First Energy Service Corporation a parent company to MedEd. He says what First Energy Service Corporation and MetEd wants and is bias toward them. Ignoring the truth is his goal. My opinion: A non-reliable witness should be ignored. John Ahr also failed to provide any documentation supporting his positions.

2. Page 4 line 7. This is a lie! Being able to see individual smart appliances and more is one of the big brags of the AMI industry. Collection and selling this information is what the AMI industry also is pushing and brags about. This is well detailed at this web page done by experts in the field and explained how it is done:
<https://guwave.com/smartmeters.html?source=sm-phrase-2&msclkid=336103cfb1ff1272adb15ccb162e783f> This is not hearsay but real evidence, with real people, and real experts in the field. For the time being, MetEd may be just looking the other way.

3. Page 4 line 8, 9. Policies? I have seen plenty of policies broken and changed or just plainly ignored and scoffed at! I have seen this plenty of times, first hand.

4. Page 4 line 10. Anybody that has seen the evidence and experience what I have experienced would throw American National Standards out as hearsay! American National Standards has ignored and scoffed at a variety of complaints, even when proven with solid proof with regards

to smart meters. American National Standards highly flawed report:
<https://blog.ansi.org/2016/04/smart-meters-are-not-dangerous/>

5. Page 5 line 11, 12. Met Ed provided no proof that their smart meters are not capable to communication with smart appliances. Clearly Met Ed made a FALSE claim when you read: See page 8 at the very top, the second line "meters cannot be used to control a customer's appliances, although the customer can activate that feature if he or she chooses. " YES, that is right, smart meters can be used to control smart devices in the house. Can Met Ed override a customer's decision? YES! I worked in the computer field and have seen in all!!!

6. Page 5 line 13. Security? I worked at a Fortune 500 company that had one of the highest security of a corporation I have ever seen. They had a layered system that was incredible. Yes, they were hacked. The person involved was fired. Anything can be hacked!!!

7. Page 5 line 14. Clearly Mr. Ahr has his head stuck in the sand as I have heard of plenty of bills that have gone up and has refused to answer why various people, for reasons unknown get spiked bills. One, with the main breaker of the house off, got a spiked bill. HOW? Clearly Mr. Ahr is bias to his employer in ignoring the truth and should be discounted as a witness.

I have provided plenty of solid evidence: Real research by federal government and county research. Real supporting evidence that people documented first hand. There is also my first hand evidence and experience.

I must make one correction on page 7 the middle of the page, this statement, "This includes interference with his phone, microwave," is wrong. I have not seen any problems with my phone and I have not used my microwave in MANY years. The rest is TRUE as when I put the Wi-Fi by the computer speakers, the pulses jump across and can be heard what is going on. This also allows in other pulses in the carrying effect. These carrying in pulses always slowed the Wi-Fi and one night, twice took the computer down. (only one night) The only possible source of these spike pulses is smart meters.

Tinnitus is a tough subject as the medical community has thrown them out. I only know the wife of one suffer and she said that she helps him COPE with his problem. Doctors did NOTHING to help him, (same as me). Avoid and stay away is our best solution. Smart meters make my condition worse. Put one on my house is totally unacceptable as I am already bothered by the neighbor's smart meters, living in town.

The DISCUSSION

My evidence is overwhelming compared to what Met Ed provided. Yes! Come to my house and see that there are no more humming birds. Come to my house and see the bees are gone with the exception of one species of small bumble bees (poor pollinators). YES! The wood bees are gone, too! What are my neighbors smart meters doing to them and me! Come and LOOK for yourself!

I have provided Government research that backs up what I am saying. This is not hearsay but REAL research, paid by tax dollars to look for TRUE ANSWERS!

I have provided what others have experienced FIRST HAND! They write about their experience and the Government research that backs this all up.

With the evidence I provided, supporting my position and health condition, clearly the law is flawed in failing to provide for health conditions. Let alone the environmental damage the smart meters are doing which is a violation of the first statement in Act 129/ house bill 2200.

Met Ed provided the biased testimony of John Ahr who also, in my opinion, lied about health issues, bills going up, smart meters security and information that can be obtained from smart meters. John Ahr is an employee for 35 years of First Energy Service Corporation and, in my opinion, is more interested in his pay check and retirement than the truth.

Real Research is not hearsay as stated page 9 end of middle paragraph. The page 9, last paragraph last full sentence, states that smart meters have special exception compared to other cases! This is a gross injustice!

The last sentence on page 9 that goes on to page 10, in my opinion, this is a GROSS MIS-STATEMENT! "but nothing regarding the service as it specifically applies to him." The truth: This service WILL adversely affect my health and the environment!

The next paragraph on page 10: I provided, sound scientific research on this subject matter proving my

position and my own experience of many years. This far outweighs the testimony of Met Ed's witness who works for the parent company and is biased to MetEd and who continues to ignore all the evidence that exists and thinks nothing of ignoring the TRUTH

The scientific evidence, itself proves that the smart meter violates the very first line of house bill 2200, Act 129, the law which has also been called hearsay.

CONCLUSIONS OF APPEAL

I have over 20 frustrating years of experience with tinnitus. I have known about the electric/magnetic component of tinnitus from well before smart meters, from experience. I have walked out of many business because of this and loud music playing. Yes, they have lost my business.

1. I have provided solid scientific research proving my case. I have also provided evident that backs what I have seen in the environment as true, my firsthand experience. Others have also provided their experience and document, first hand their observation of environmental impact.
2. Met Ed provided only a bias employee of the parent company to give testimony of his opinion and NO scientific proof supporting his position. Policy really is nothing more than hearsay and can be ignored, broken, changed and scoffed at.
3. Page 10 paragraph # 3. I have provided plenty of my experience and scientific evidence supporting my position.
4. Page 11 paragraph # 4. I have provided an abundance of evidence of both my experience and others.
5. Page 11 paragraph # 5, 6. Solid evidence was provided to prove both health and environment impact being done by the smart meter.
6. Page 11 paragraph # 7. This statement is in total conflict with the statement in paragraph # 4, "by even the smallest degree."
7. Page 11 paragraph # 8. I have provided substantial evidence that far beyond paragraph # 4 and way beyond trace or suspicion.
8. Page 11 paragraph # 9. This is INSANE!!! Who wants to be the subject to be damaged to meet this requirement? Research, REAL RESEARCH provides plenty of evidence without harming humans in court to prove this!!! But, there are many out there that have already been damaged, but this court rejects them and what they have experienced let alone the doctors and research that back them up.
9. Page 11 paragraph # 10, 11. The public utility is required to provide a safe service and the smart meters are far from safe at the research I have provided and my own experience.
10. Page 11 paragraph # 12, 13. Research is not hearsay.
11. Page 11 paragraph # 14. I have provided PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, not opinions or perceptions.
12. Page 11 paragraph # 15. I have not only provided personal experience but also government research into various matters regarding the health and environment that the smart meter

causes. Clearly, it is not SAFE to install a smart meter on my home as I am already affected by the neighbors smart meters and the environment also show the damage smart meters are causing, as the humming birds are GONE and the bees are GONE. Yes, I have plants that honey bees love and the honey bees are GONE!

CLEARLY THS ORDER NEEDS TO BE REVERSED IN MY FAVOR or AN EXCEPTIONS IN MY CASE

Date 7/13/2020

_____/s/_____

Ethan Habrial