Laraine C. Abbey-Katzev RN emeritus, MS, CNS

Certified Nutrition Specialist 35 Troon Court Monroe Township, NJ 08831

July 5,2017

Certified Mail * Return Receipt Requested

Rosemarie Chiavetta, Secretary Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Commonwealth of Pennsylvania P.O. Box 3265 Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Administrative Law Judge Darlene D. Heep Administrative Law Judge Christopher P. Pell Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission 801 Market St., Ste. 4063 Philadelphia, PA 19107

First Class USPS Mail

Gladys M. Brown, Chairperson Andrew G. Place, Vice Chairman John F. Coleman, Jr., Commissioner Robert F. Powelson, Commissioner Robert F. Powelson, Commissioner Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission P.O. Box 3265 Harrisburg; PA 17.105-3265

Ward Smith, Esq. Shawane Lee, Esq. **Exelon Business Services Company LLC** Legal Department 2301 Market Street, S23-1 Philadelphia, PA 19103

Ref.: Docket No. C-2015-2474602 Catherine J Frompovich v. PECO Energy Company

Dear Secretary Chiavetta, et al:

As an attendee of the hearings of Ms. Frompovich's pro se lawsuit with the PA PUC I was shocked to read Ward Smith's response to Ms. Frompovich's Exceptions Protest response to Judge Heep's initial decision.

Smith's document appears to me replete with falsehoods and outright misstatements. My reading of this is he appears to have committed perjury! After reading Smith's response I suddenly thought "Now, I understand why Judge Pell was removed from decision-making despite being present for the entire hearing." Judge Pell was assertive in asking and ascertaining from Mr. Prichard that smart meters pulse every 30 seconds indefinitely and can't be stopped or adjusted, and that there is no option with that. p.169 (1-17).

The Zigbee radio, if not paired, keeps emitting signals while hunting for appliances or other devices with which to pair. Ward Smith quotes commentary on p.134 but ignores later testimony on p.169 (1-17), which demonstrates the dangers of smart meters and the actuality that smart meters pulse thousands of times per day and such pulses have biological effects.

RECEIVED

JUL - 6 2017

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION SECRETARY'S BUREAU

I felt like Alice in Wonderland when I read on p.7 lines 2 & 3 of Ward Smith's comment, "it was Ms. Frompovich who, despite repeated opportunities and entreaties, refused to provide testimony." Welcome to the tea party, Alice!

Ms. Frompovich was attempting to submit hundreds of published scientific references stating there are established dangers of EMFs upon biological systems including cancer. Ms. Frompovich was NOT submitting second party comments upon the research, which would clearly have been hearsay. Is the court requiring that each of the original authors of each of the hundreds of studies be present in the court to not be hearsay? Dr. Israel didn't bring his authors to court, and although the court accorded Israel expert status on EMFs and cancer, it was clear during Ms. Frompovich's questioning of Dr. Israel that his knowledge of the subject was limited as he lacked knowledge of many of the questions she asked him. Dr. Israel's knowledge of EMFs' impact on health and cancer was severely lacking.

Dr. Israel didn't bring his quoted authors to court either, yet I believe his referenced authors were accepted and not considered hearsay. It seemed that everything PECO referenced was admitted even though Israel's and ICNIRP references were all also from the internet. Ward Smith quotes Judge Heep that Frompovich's documents will not be admitted, so it seems document acceptance depends upon which side is submitting the documents.

It appears that an apparently incompetent, but live and present, expert is acceptable to the court, while hundreds of scientific articles of published research are collectively dismissed as hearsay. While the hearsay rulings could make sense as applied to individual papers that may, or may not, stand up to scrutiny, it seems a gross injustice to apply inadmissibility to a collection of hundreds of papers trumpeting concerns, dangers and proofs of harm.

Is this court's purpose to ignore or prevent admission of information that stands in opposition to PECO and the PA PUCs claims of safety of their smart meters? Is this court's purpose to deprive Pennsylvanians of their legislatively ruled, and thus legal right, to say NO to opting-in on smart meters? Is this court's purpose to take away citizens' individual liberty and Constitutionally protected right of privacy, which is violated by smart meters, by allowing the PA PUC to force a technology of hotly debated safety that also engages in invasion of privacy by tracking appliance use?

I sincerely hope not.

I pray that the court seeks Truth and the protection of health, liberty and privacy of Pennsylvania's citizens.

Sincerely

Asame C. Alber

Laraine C. Abbey RN, MS, CNS Certified Nutrition Specialist Email: <u>marevivo@aol.com</u> Mobile1-732-232-8452

DY DAMIELS ARS LARAINE C. ABREY KATZEY 35 Troon CL U.S. POSTAGE Monny Two N1 08831 MONROE TOWNSHIP, NJ 1000 17105 Rosemarce Cheavetta, Secretary PA Public Utility Commission Commwealth of Pennseylvania P.O. BOX 32651 arrisburg PA 17/05-3265 n.i ւնինությաներիններություններություններ 17105-326565