



Joplin Public Library

1901 E 20th Street, Joplin, MO 64804

Fax (417) 624-5217

Library (417) 623-7953

FILED

JAN 02 2026

Missouri Public Service Commission

FAX

Reference & ILL (417) 624-5465

ATTENTION PSC Case Docket

DATE 12/31/25

COMPANY EC-2026-0150

FAX# 573-526-1500

From: Elizabeth Peterson claimant Total pages, including cover sheet 31

Message:

Majority BULK OF Judges Requested Responses
and including a Judicial Assessment Diagnosis
on ALJ state Jurisdiction limitations
overcome by alternate first phase Broader
Approach to Safety & Health Jurisdiction

X

CASE EC-2026-0150 Elizabeth Peterson

Glossary of Submission for bulk of response by Jan. 8th

C - Full Sheet pg. ZERO

P.O.A.

pgs. 1-7

E-mails from Spire

pgs. A 1-7

ADA relevant

A. 1* Health Concerns Analog

Response to what Tariff

A. 2* Tariff those are 150 pgs.

Formal ADA Request

pgs. B 1-4

Certified Mail Spire ADA

pgs. C 1-2

Spire request for PSC

pg. D 1 Spire only gave me one day

to get Physician info.

Investigation Entity's STATE

pg. E 1 Fire Inspector relay to PSC

pg. E 2 Fire and Hanaways Entities

Case Jurisdiction Diagnosis
with ADA implementation
OR Safety Broad Scope
State Scope Approach
overcoming Jurisdiction Road blocks

Pg. F 1-5

X

FULL SHEET OF RESPONSES

pg. ZERO

CASE EC-2026-0150 Elizabeth Peterson POA

The list of Responses are forthcoming wanted to get some off the checklist

Party Status is Caregiver and POA for Disabled individual who is mostly homebound.

Liberty has not provided qualified assurance of Safe ANALOG which is an ADA accommodation for health concerns. That is the one law violated that in fact other Utility Vendors found intention to hold their own Jurisdiction over ADA within their own framework. The request I made of Liberty is not without proper time impossible for me to carry out like I did with Spire two years ago. The negotiation with Spire began in early Sept. 2023 and once we they received the formal complaint I requested response within two months so that they could make their best attempt to not be rushed. In the end the template I've enclosed was recommended by that Vendor to best be brought before PSC. They did not give me more than one day to gather the medical information they requested and it was insufficient.

The relevance of this Spire oriented Vendor submission is in that I did make effort to discuss with Liberty to do an ADA accommodation. Yet, it was made aware that their desire was to present with Tribunal immediately at threat of removal of my ANALOG meter which is not causing any danger?? The Liberty describes they are out of ANALOGS. That is okay I can wait until they locate one. That is what I require for the ADA accommodation with PSC oversight to keep everyone amicable. The minute Liberty removes the ANALOG they are literally committing a change medically speaking and that is the ADA violation. It is only relevant to note that Tribunal exists to make services that are compliant despite jurisdiction the observation of Vendors delegation has to be observed as was why the other outcome ended abruptly and without sounding repetitive the other Vendor said this matter would be the type of matter to be best handled by Tribunal. So, if there is a different Commission that Tribunal wishes to eventually transfer this case it was recommended that Human Rights commission would be suitable. The role of Consumer and Utility Vendor complaints are in general handled by PSC, yet I did not understand that Spire was mistaken to refer this type of case to PSC? It sounds like in general the Vendors needs a system in place for ADA accommodation. But, where the state jurisdictions lies could be elsewhere. However, the other matters I have not had time to bring into would avert the ADA perhaps altogether. I just need to qualify that my efforts are meritorious and that I will submit that new complaint in time to allow Liberty to respond. Pending how the ADA is going according to Liberty's turn to respond.

The factor of ADA is something that perhaps could be integrated with MO PSC as to provide the means necessary for ADA compliance of the Utility Vendors who do feel that the current Tariff is permissive in this Liberty case matter to uphold that there not an accommodation request for an ADA Analog to remain as the meter.

The medical part on this can be separately addressed, but to skip that for now I need to put into place a current moratorium of safe equipment removal. The Liberty told Jay Eastlick that according to their current Tariff they can opt for an advanced meter alternative. This would violate ADA law.

The CSR 4240-10.035 rule making hearing as a matter of public record defined via an In Expert in person with EMR credentials which substantiated my claim that the non RF Advanced meter is actually emitting what is termed as a transient also called more commonly D.E. dirty electricity. There are two Types of EMF one is ELF fields from electrical bleed off as D.E. dirty electricity. The other is RF radiation. Liberty is attempting to place a non RF Advanced meter which emits ELF as synthetic EMF; electromagnetic frequency which is very harmful to health.

The other point is the Advanced meters are also a safety hazard.

The response to what entities of the state are involved in founded evidence on this safety hazard of Advanced meters is MO Division of Fire. Chief Matt Luetkemeyer and the other State Entity is General Hanaway's Office.

The re address on this with Fire Division is noted on pg. E 1 & 2. The initial prior outreach to the Division this is noted. The current outreach is on pg. E 2 and that e-mail went to Fire and also to Hannaway's Office assigned person Alexis Wolfe. The fact is both a fire investigator is being looked over they just received the 4 packets of white papers from the highly credible retired DOD and Engineer with years of research and international UL industry background. The white papers take time for these state investigators to review. As far as Hanaway's that would be for product recall. The one Senator's Chief of Staff who is checking in with those folks is Senator Moon's. So, I would in the meantime be founded with grounds to refuse any Advanced meter substitute for the ANALOG on the disabled persons home is actually fully functional and it is not capable of being a fire hazard due to the type of componentry and that is described extensively in those white papers which have been provided by a Scientific Engineer so to speak. The fire hazard is grounds for formal refusal to be compromised by removal of the safe functioning ANALOG that is not a health hazard and not capable of causing fire hazard and shock.

The State as an ENTITY of all aspects of this particular Case matter has been required as the units of function are part of the whole. The right for my discovery was based on allowing time for the addressing properly of health and safety and ADA is actually already accommodated with the ANALOG so it is not on our end as the claimant that is dissatisfied. It is Liberty determination to take a safe home environment and make it a hazard for health and for safety. So, at this point the other things that are in the Jurisdiction if Liberty so chooses is to conduct similar to what Spire was doing whereby Liberty can request Medical reasons if necessary why the ANALOG is medically approved and would make a condition worse due to the EMF. These are the things I asked of Spire and yet they got in a one day rush to have my medical information when I just barely got their letter requesting that information.

So, the role that ALJ would be good as jurisdiction is to continue to let Liberty fulfill all the needs of ADA that their interior legal staff wants and of course make sure I get the correct amount of time necessary to provide those medical requests. And to overcome any objections in a manner that is not dismissive towards these specifications. To allow me time for any clarity they feel lacks etc.

The other role of jurisdiction is to address the Fire Safety when your other state Agencies feel they have proper time to render those.

The additional state entity that might need called upon would of course be Chief Medical Stanislaugh she has worked on prior medical input for the need to understand often take an Agency of that field to interpret and convey reports and substantiate the queries of quandaries of the Utility Vendors as they analyze medical information. But, I never got that chance with Spire. Fortunately, they do not want to remove our Analog so that is all I really need from them as a Vendor.

The new additional complaint I already provided to Liberty prior to the case submission however it did not get in the initial submission. I will retrieve that and add the statutes that are violated on that issue prior to Jan. 8th. But, I did want to get the bulk of the response in to be timely.

Recorded in Jasper County, Missouri



Charlotte Pickering

RECORDER OF DEEDS
JASPER COUNTY, MISSOURI

Recording Date/Time: 06/26/2015 at 08:31:24 AM

Book: 2364 Page: 445

Instr #: 2015009609

Type: POA

Pages: 8

Fee: \$46.00 & 20150001292



Charlotte Pickering
Recorder of Deeds

JASPER COUNTY ANNEX II
116 W. SECOND + P.O. BOX 387
CARTHAGE, MISSOURI 64836

(417) 358-0431 or 358-0432
JOPLIN: 625-4371
FAX: (417) 359-1201

e-mail: recorder@jaspercounty.org
Web Page: jaspercounty.org/recorder

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: DPOA

DATE OF DOCUMENT:

GRANTOR(S): Mike R. Avery

GRANTEE(S): Elizabeth A. Peterson

GRANTEE(S) MAILING ADDRESS: 1221 Euclid Ave.
Joplin, MO 64801

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OR WHERE LOCATED IN
DOCUMENT: N/A

REFERENCE BOOK AND PAGE:

DURABLE POWER OF ATTORNEY

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

That I, **MIKE R. AVERY**, DOB 12/4/1969, SS #XXX-XX-4988, of 1221 EUCLID AVENUE, JOPLIN, JASPER COUNTY, MISSOURI 64801, do hereby make, constitute and appoint **ELIZABETH A. PETERSON**, 1221 EUCLID AVENUE, JOPLIN, JASPER COUNTY, MISSOURI 64801, TELEPHONE 417-627-9154, my true and lawful attorney-in-fact to manage and conduct all of my property and affairs and, for that purpose and in my name, to do any act or execute any document pertaining to any of my real or personal property, business and affairs, as fully and to all intents and purposes as I might or could do if personally present and acting on my own behalf. Without limiting or in any manner restricting the foregoing, I specifically authorize my attorney-in-fact:

1. **Execution of Contracts.** To enter into, perform, modify, extend, cancel, compromise, enforce or otherwise act with respect to any contract of any sort whatsoever, including, but not limited to, leases and mortgages; and to pay any money or to transfer title and possession to any real or personal property that may be required to be paid or transferred by any contract or in the performance of any obligation entered into or incurred by me or on my behalf.
2. **Investments.** To invest in all forms of real and personal property without any restriction whatsoever as to the kind of investment.
3. **Registration of Property.** To hold property unregistered or in the name of a nominee.
4. **Personal Property.** To buy or sell at public or private sale for cash or credit or partly for each, exchange, pledge, lease, give or acquire options for sales or exchanges or leases; or by any other means whatsoever to acquire, dispose of, repair, alter or manage tangible or intangible personal property or any interest therein; and, without limitation, with respect to any securities, to comply with any securities laws or regulations, to execute indemnity agreements, to purchase insurance and to pay commissions or discounts required by any underwriting.
5. **Real Property.** To buy or sell at public or private sale for cash or credit or partly for each, exchange, mortgage, encumber, lease for any period of time, give or acquire options for sales, purchases, exchanges or leases, dedicate or by any other means whatsoever to acquire or dispose of real property or any interest therein; to partition and subdivide real property; to manage real property; to repair, alter, erect or tear down any structure or part thereof; and to file such plans, applications or other documents in connection therewith and do such other acts as may be requested by any government or other authority having or purporting to have jurisdiction.
6. **Securities.** To vote in person or by proxy at any meeting, to join in any merger, reorganization, voting-trust plan or other concerted action of security holders, to make payments in connection therewith, and in general to exercise all rights of a security holder.

7. **Insurance.** To procure, alter, extend or cancel insurance against any and all risks affecting property and persons, and against liability, damage or claim of any sort; and to exercise any nonforfeiture provisions of life insurance policies.
8. **Loans.** To borrow money in such amounts, for such periods and upon such terms as my attorney-in-fact shall deem proper and to secure any loan by the mortgage or pledge of any property.
9. **Bank Accounts.** To sign checks, drafts and other instruments or otherwise make withdrawals from any checking, savings, transaction or other deposit account in my name, and to endorse checks payable to me and receive the proceeds thereof in cash or otherwise; to open and close checking, savings, transaction or other deposit accounts in my name; to purchase and redeem savings certificates, certificates of deposit or similar instruments in my name; to execute and deliver receipts for any funds withdrawn or certificates redeemed; and to do all acts regarding any checking account, savings account, savings certificate, certificate of deposit or similar instrument that I now have or may hereafter acquire, the same as I could do if personally present.

Any financial institution may continue to rely on this power of attorney until it receives written notice from me that this power of attorney is revoked or actual notice of my death and shall be indemnified and held harmless by me and my estate, personal representatives, and heirs against any liability or loss, including attorneys' fees, costs of suit and claims of third parties, which it might incur by relying on this power of attorney after termination or revocation but before it receives such notice, or at anytime because of wrongful acts, omission or representations of my attorney-in-fact with respect to transactions covered by this power of attorney. My attorney-in-fact shall be subject to such bank rules and regulations to which I would be subject.

10. **Safe Deposit Boxes.** To have access to and control over the contents of any safe deposit box rented by me, to rent safe deposit boxes in my name, to close out and execute and deliver receipts for safe deposit boxes in my name and to do all acts regarding any safe deposit box that I now have or may hereafter acquire, the same as I could do if personally present.

Any financial institution may continue to rely on this power of attorney until it receives written notice from me that this power of attorney is revoked or actual notice of my death and shall be indemnified and held harmless by me and my estate, personal representatives and heirs against any liability or loss, including attorneys' fees, costs of suit and claims of third parties, which it might incur by relying on this power of attorney after termination or revocation but before it receives such notice, or at any time because of wrongful acts, omissions or representations of my attorneys-in-fact with respect to transactions covered by this power of attorney. My attorney-in-fact shall be subject to such bank rules and regulations to which I would be subject.

11. **Receipts and Approval of Accounts.** To receive a payment of any kind, including a bequest, devise, gift or other transfer of real or personal property to me in my own right or as a fiduciary for another, and to give full receipt and acquittance therefore, or a refunding bond therefore, to approve accounts of any business, estate, trust, partnership or other


transaction whatsoever in which I may have any interest of any nature whatsoever, and to enter into any compromise and release in regard thereto.

- 12. **Compromise and Arbitration of Claims.** To compromise or arbitrate any claim in which I may be in any manner interested, and for that purpose to enter into agreements to compromise or arbitrate, and either through counsel or otherwise to carry on such compromise or arbitration and perform or enforce any award entered in arbitration.
- 13. **Institution and Defense of Claims.** To institute, prosecute, defend, compromise or otherwise dispose of, and to appear for me in any proceedings at law or in equity or otherwise before any tribunal for the enforcement or for the defense of any claim, either alone or in conjunction with other persons, relating to me or to any property of mine or any other person, and to retain, discharge and substitute counsel and authorize appearance of such counsel to be entered for me in any such action or proceeding.
- 14. **Taxes.** To prepare, execute and file in my name and on my behalf any return, report, protest, application for correction of assessed valuation of real or other property, appeal, brief, claim for refund or petition, including petition to the United States Tax Court, in connection with any tax imposed or purported to be imposed by any government, authority or agency, or claimed, levied or assessed by any government, authority or agency, and to pay any such tax and to obtain any extension of time for any of the foregoing; to execute waivers of restrictions on the assessment and collection of deficiency in any tax; to execute closing agreements and all other documents, instruments and papers relating to any tax liability of mine of any sort; to institute and carry on either through counsel or otherwise any proceeding in connection with contesting any such tax or to recover any tax paid or to resist any claim for additional tax or any proposed assessment or levy thereof; and to enter into any agreements or stipulations for compromise or other adjustment or disposition of any tax.
- 15. **Disclaimer.** To execute, deliver and file for record disclaimers of any part or all of any property, power or interest passing to or for me under any will, deed, trust or otherwise.
- 16. **Creation of Trust** To create a revocable trust for my benefit under the terms of which (i) my attorney-in-fact or any one or more other persons or corporations with fiduciary powers selected by my attorney-in-fact is named as the trustee or trustees, (ii) during my lifetime the entire net income and as much of the principal as I or my attorney-in-fact direct or my trustee thinks desirable shall be paid to me or as my attorney-in-fact shall direct and (iii) upon my death the principal and any undistributed income shall be payable to the executor or administrator of my estate, and to transfer property to the trustee or trustees thereunder.
- 17. **Gifts.** To make or revoke any gifts to any individual or trust, excluding to my attorney-in-fact, that my attorney-in-fact determines that I would have made or revoked myself.
- 18. **Employment of Others.** To employ accountants, attorneys-at-law, investment counsel, custodians, agents, servants and others, to delegate to them, to remove them, to appoint others in their places and to pay them such remuneration as my attorney-in-fact shall deem proper.

19. **Execution of Documents.** To execute, deliver, file for record, cancel, modify, amend or revoke, endorse, acquire or dispose of any instrument, including but not limited to trust agreements, stock and bond powers, vehicle registrations, financing statements, and related filing documents, reports of any sort to any government, authority or agency, as required or permitted by law, deeds with or without covenants or warranties and any other document appropriate for carrying out any of the foregoing powers.
20. **Creation of Survivorship Interests.** To create or change survivorship interests in my property or in the property in which I may have an interest, provided, however, that the inclusion of the authority set out in this paragraph shall not be necessary in order to grant to an attorney-in-fact acting under a power of attorney granting general powers with respect to all lawful subjects and purposes the authority to withdraw funds or other property from any account, contract or other similar arrangement held in my name in one or more other persons with any financial institution, brokerage company or other depository to the same extent that I would be authorized to do if I were present, not disabled or incapacitated, and seeking to act on my own behalf.
21. **Designation of Beneficiaries.** To designate or change the designation of beneficiaries to receive any property, benefit or contract right on my death.
22. **Autopsy Examination.** To give or withhold consent to an autopsy or postmortem examination.
23. **General.** To do all things which my attorney-in-fact shall deem proper in order to carry out any of the foregoing enumerated powers, which shall be construed in the broadest possible manner. It is my intention in executing this document, to delegate to my attorney-in-fact all matters concerning me, my affairs, my business and my real and personal property as fully as I might do, and as if I had done, if personally acting in my own behalf. The descriptive headings of this general power of attorney are inserted for convenience only and shall not be deemed to affect the meaning or construction of any of the provisions hereof or to limit in any way the construction thereof in the broadest possible manner.
24. **Guardianship.** In the event that any court proceedings are initiated for the purpose of protecting my person and/or estate, then to the extent that I am permitted by law to do so, I hereby nominate, constitute and appoint my attorney-in-fact to serve as guardian, conservator or in any similar representative capacity for my estate. I direct that my attorney-in-fact while serving in that capacity be permitted to serve without bond or other security.
25. **Substitution.** My attorney-in-fact shall have full power of substitution and revocation, and such substitution or revocation may relate to, or be limited to, any one or more or all of the foregoing acts or powers, or be limited as to time or in such other respect as my attorney-in-fact shall deem proper.


- 26. **Indemnification.** My attorney-in-fact is authorized to indemnify and hold harmless any third party who accepts and acts under this Durable Power of Attorney.
- 27. **Ratification.** I hereby ratify and confirm all that my attorney-in-fact or the substitute or substitutes therefore shall lawfully do or cause to be done by virtue of this document.
- 28. **Effect of My Disability.** Pursuant to RSMo. §404.705 et seq., this is a durable power of attorney and the authority of my attorney- in-fact shall not terminate if I become disabled or incapacitated or in the event of later uncertainty as to whether I am dead or alive.
- 29. **Prior Designations Revoked.** I hereby revoke any prior Durable Power of Attorney.
- 30. **Copies.** A photocopy of this Durable Power of Attorney shall be as effective and valid as the original document.
- 31. **Governing Law.** This power of attorney shall be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the law of the State of Missouri.


In Witness Whereof, I have executed this Durable Power of Attorney this 9 day of AUGUST, 2013.


MIKE R. AVERY

8-9-13
Date

The foregoing document was signed in our presence on the day listed above and each of the undersigned is signing as a witness at the request of MIKE R. AVERY.


Witness 1


Witness 2


STATE OF MISSOURI)
) ss.
COUNTY OF JASPER)

On this 9 day of AUGUST, 2013, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the County and State aforesaid, personally appeared MIKE R. AVERY, to me known to be the person described in the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged that he executed the same as his free act and deed.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal in Joplin the day and year above written.

Sandy Blackford
Notary Public

In and for the County of Jasper and State of Missouri.
My commission expires:




STATE OF MISSOURI)
) ss.
COUNTY OF JASPER)

On this 9 day of AUGUST, 2013, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the County and State aforesaid, personally appeared Shellen Boston and Jamil Blood, known to me to be the persons who signed the foregoing instrument as witnesses to the signature of MIKE R. AVERY and acknowledged that they signed the same as their free act and deed.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal in Joplin the day and year above written.

Sandy Blackford
Notary Public

In and for the County of Jasper and State of Missouri.
My commission expires:



Letter of Request for Reasonable Accommodations

Subject: Spire GAS Consumer; Mike Avery established as a DISABLED person requesting Fee offset. All formulary for a disabled person with a medical smart meter opt out such fees are by definition ADA inclusive.

ANY penalizing Fees for the Medically based accommodation are Impermissible under ADA.

Case and point the disabled are "not" electing to opt out; they are by the Utility Corporation be given the concession for a "Medical " opt out so therefore the ADA accommodation is granted and does not include an elected opt out as a choice. Treating this accommodation as a choice is Impermissible and any associative fees for normal opt out consumers are not granted governance by the ADA compliances.

FEDERAL REGULATORY/ ADA COMPLIANCE

OFFICIAL DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT of Fee surcharges upon a Medically opted out circumstance these are Medical orientation of mitigating circumstances which supersede any state Tariff's. Such Tariff's are not applicable to a Medical opt out consumer by the very nature of the opt out is not elective in orientation.

Medical opt out is ADA compliance based and granted on those grounds.

REGARDS to Spire Utilities Unlawful Fee practice and policy pertaining to Federal Discrimination Law ADA/ADAA and FHAA

Mike Avery

Plaintiff Contact Party Name; POA Representation

**Elizabeth Peterson; POA
1221 Euclid Ave.
Joplin, MO 64801
(417) 626-2125
Buffypeterson@hotmail.com**

3rd September 2023

Mark Darrell; Senior VP, Chief Legal & Compliance Officer
Corporate Spire Gas; Legal Division Compliance
Pertaining to Federal Compliance; ADA Accommodations (Consumer)
700 Market St.
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 342-0500

Dear Spire Compliance Chief Officer; Mark Darrell,

The service at Mike Avery's house is currently one of Analog meter. Upon my first level of formal correspondence with Spire, to cease and desist discriminatory fee practices/ the response from Corporate was that the matter was under review.

The Plaintiff/Consumer is requesting these special accommodations remain intact without subjection to state Tariff fee's which in this case matter are actualized by health safety protections of the Disabled to allow the consumer to stand on merit in a position that any fees associated with opt out are in fact by Case Law matter whereby the state Tariff would be construed as a direct contradiction to Federal supersede of ADA accommodations. Medical opt out ensures that health as a mitigating circumstance of the disabled provides and establishes these individuals are ensured protection by ADA per their health cannot be compromised as such Utility Corporation smart meters are known to pose serious RF radiation environmental exposure which is also an EMF health hazard risk. ¹ <https://www.aaemonline.org> American Academy of Environmental Medicine.

Illinois AG issues Consumer Alert on "Smart Meters"<https://smartgridawareness.org/2016/03/25/illinois-attorney-general-issues-consumer-alert-on-smart-meters/>

¹ AAEM; American Academy of Environmental Medicine the practice of health based on environmental factors. This is science back evidence of the emerging illness of Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity. This sensitivity is caused by RF radiation which is caused by Smart Meters.

As a US court Federal matter this link will provide these types of consumer cases have been going on since 2014 with the introduction to smart meters even in these early saga's Big Corporations motions to Dismiss claimants with Medical considerations bringing Injunctive relief of fees for opt out were not granted to Big Corp even with Pro Se' claimant. C-this referenced case https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCOURTS-med-2_20-cv-00237/pdf/USCOURTS-med-2_20-cv-00237-0.pdf whereby the motion to dismiss the claimant was not granted.

Specifically ²The disabled must be waived from discriminatory Fee practices which do not align with ADA opt out preclusion as a health concern matter per the predisposition of the disabled's person's multiple medical conditions. The ADA accommodations are there along with ensuring protections of the opt out as FULL CASE SCOPE of that same disabled person's protections to fees incurred by the opt out system in place with the Utility Corporation. The disabled are ensured equal opportunity to live in and enjoy their residences and receive full access to gas and electric services without RF radiation exposure. Likewise, It is unlawful thereby to cause further harm impact by Fee's for that same opt out ADA disabled person's protection

² Any smart meter opt out fees that qualify under specifically the Consumer's being disabled was granted by their medical fragility. In this specified matter of Mike Avery right to accommodation thereby the origin of the Disabled individual's eligibility for opt out- per the ADA disabled accommodation Act are subsequently also categorical as fee proof as the origin of the ADA the Corporation can not ensue upon the disabled opt out consumer's "any" additional fees as the opt out was not an elective choice it was a medically necessary and clinically appropriate choice. The delineation of The disabled person as a must opt out is rendered under "necessary reasons of reasonable accommodations act" on that same concession the ADA cannot allow the Consumer to be subjected to Utility Corporate Fee penalization upon that same disabled consumer for this fee again would be part of the reasonable accommodations expectation of the ADA act. The disability of concession there is no additional fees that would be considered permissible. The delineation as a specifically a disabled person opt out is already aligned as the precluded qualification as pertinent in that by their disability opt out categorical their account is not fee accessible as the fee is not applicable to this specific type of opt out as the Disabled opt out categorical. "Smart meter opt-out fees that were unlawful surcharges against a disabled person (ADA Title II Technical Assistance Manual, II-1.3000 Relationship to title III)" c-citation case Nina Beety In my first correspondence as it was previously referenced there.

As a qualified disabled Consumer with multiple medical conditions, which are protected by Hippa, this Disabled account holder is Federally eligible for reasonable accommodations under ADA as defined by the Fair Housing Amendments Act, and Section 504, Title 10, as well as other related state and federal discrimination laws.

As POA I am giving one last attempt at reciprocation of correspondence with Spire before I move towards filing a Discrimination complaint with the MO. Division that handles these matters for this claimant.

I have handy a couple of civil action citation cases that I curated which upon Spire's furtherment of despondence I will submit formally to the Discrimination Board located in MO Jefferson City. Hereby, should Spire's despondence after this notice continue I will have to proceed with the Board that offered for MO.

This is my final notice of attempt to work directly on this matter with Spire. This direct communication offer Expires on Oct. 31, 2023 at which point this private negotiation on this matter with Spire first hand will expire and be extinguished.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Peterson; POA

My cell is 417-629-8789



Spire Missouri Inc.
700 Market Street
St. Louis, MO 63101

CONFIDENTIAL

October 31, 2023

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Elizabeth Peterson
1221 Euclid Avenue
Joplin, MO 64801

RE: Mike Avery - Request for Waiver of Automated Meter Reading Opt-Out Fee

Dear Ms. Peterson,

Spire Missouri Inc. ("Spire" or "Company") is in receipt of your September 3, 2023 letter in regard to the Automated Meter Reading Opt-Out fee that is currently being assessed to Mr. Mike Avery. We know that you have also taken the time to speak with Spire representatives about this matter and appreciate you allowing us the opportunity to review and respond to your concerns.

As Mr. Avery has an analog meter at his address, he is currently being assessed a \$30 opt-out fee in accordance with Spire's Rules and Regulations Tariff Sheet No. R-7, which was approved by the Missouri Public Service Commission and effective on December 23, 2021. Spire's tariffs, approved by the Commission, carry the force and effect of law. This specific tariff sheet, No. R-7, allows Spire to install non-standard metering equipment for customers that want a manually read ("analog") meter, but it also mandates that Spire charge a monthly manual meter read fee. The purpose of this fee is to recover the costs incurred by the Company to accommodate requests for analog meters, specifically the costs of sending an employee to read these meters, so the Company's other customers are not burdened with such costs. As Mr. Avery had an analog meter prior to the tariff sheet being approved, once our billing system was updated to account for this new fee, he started seeing this fee on his bill.

We understand that you are requesting that Mr. Avery not be charged the Automated Meter Reading Opt-Out fee as you have stated he has a disability that would be impacted by our standard meter. The Americans with Disabilities Act requires reasonable accommodations for disabled individuals and requires such individuals to specifically identify the disability and resulting limitations from such disability. *Windham v. Harris County, Texas*, 875 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2017). Therefore, in order to ensure Spire is providing Mr. Avery with the appropriate reasonable accommodation, which, in this situation, would be the continued use of the analog meter without being charged the Automated Meter Reading Opt-Out fee, Spire requires that Mr. Avery provide documented, medical proof of his disability and how Spire's standard meter impacts his disability.

Spire would also note that in *Friedman v. Central Maine Power Company*, , while the court dismissed the utility's motion to dismiss the discrimination lawsuit over smart meter opt-out fees, the court explained that in order to prevail, the customer bringing the lawsuit would have to prove that the smart meter actually risks worsening his medical condition, specifically his cancer progression or symptoms. *Friedman v. Central Maine Power Company*; No. 2:20-CV-00237-JDL, 2021 WL 1234638 (D. Maine Mar. 31, 2021); See also *Richardson v. Cardinal Ritter Residential Servs.*, No. 4:23-CV-151 RLW, 2023 WL 2139318, at *2 (E.D. Mo. Feb. 21, 2023) (dismissing disability discrimination claim because the plaintiff failed to plead sufficient facts to state a claim under Title III of the ADA because she did "not identify her disability, assert that defendant is a place of public accommodation, or explain the factual circumstances which caused her to be denied a full and equal opportunity to enjoy the housing that defendant provides.").

Please advise of whether you or Mr. Avery will be providing the requested information to Spire, and we will determine the appropriate method of your transmittal of the documentation for our review. Spire will ensure that this documentation is not shared with any third-party and it will only be disclosed to Spire's legal team and those on a need-to-know basis. Please also let us know if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,



Matthew Aplington
General Counsel
314.342.0785
matt.aplington@spireenergy.com

J. Antonio Arias
Counsel, Regulatory
314-342-0655
antonio.arias@spireenergy.com

D 1

From: Haarjustice, Alex <Alex.Haarjustice@spenergy.com>
Sent: Friday, November 3, 2023 11:05 AM
To: Buffy Peterson <buffypeterson@hotmail.com>; Anas, Antonio <Antonio.Anas@spenergy.com>
Cc: Aplington, Matt <Matt.Aplington@spenergy.com>; Westbrook, Jamie <Jamie.Westbrook@spenergy.com>
Subject: RE: Analog Meter Reading Fee
Ms. Peterson,

Unfortunately, the description contained in the letter does not contain sufficient detail under the definition of disability contained in the ADA. Again, the ADA requires individuals to specifically identify the disability and resulting limitations from such disability. The Missouri Public Service Commission remains the only appropriate public body to review your request for a waiver of the fee.

Thank you,
Alex

From: Coston, Karri Karri.Coston@spireenergy.com

To: buffypeterson@hotmail.com

Date: Mon, Aug 14, 2023, 4:26 PM

RulesRegs_Missouri_03102023.pdf 317 KB

Hello Buffy,

Thank you again for speaking with me. I completely understand your positioning on the smart meters and the ability to opt out for health reasons.* As explained, this is an option, but it does come with a fee. The policies and fees have been approved by regulatory agencies, all of which if you need details are listed on our website, but I have attached the pages here for your convenience.

Local Natural Gas Rates and Tariffs | Spire Inc. (spireenergy.com)

Thanks!

Karri Coston
Coach, Customer Experience

800 Market Street
St. Louis, MO 63101
314-342-0760 Office
314-566-4529 Mobile

SpireEnergy.com



P.S.C. MO. No. 9

Original

SHEET No. R-1

Spire Missouri Inc. d/b/a/ Spire

For: Spire Missouri

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SPIRE MISSOURI INC.

STANDARD RULES AND REGULATIONS

APPLYING TO MISSOURI SERVICE AREAS:

SPIRE MISSOURI WEST OPERATING UNIT

All areas and communities served in Andrew, Barry, Barton, Buchanan, Carroll, Cass, Cedar, Christian, Clay, Clinton, Cooper, Dade, DeKalb, Greene, Henry, Howard, Jackson, Jasper, Johnson, Lafayette, Lawrence, McDonald, Moniteau, Newton, Pettis, Platte, Ray, Saline, Stone, and Vernon Counties.

DATE OF ISSUE: November 23, 2021

DATE EFFECTIVE: December 23, 2021

ISSUED BY: Scott A. Weltzel, Managing Director, Regulatory & Legislative Affairs
Spire Missouri Inc., St. Louis, MO. 63101

FILED
Missouri Public
Service Commission
GR-2021-0108; YG-2022-0162

Sent: Monday, August 14, 2023 5:07 PM
To: Connect With Christopher <CGagliano@spireenergy.com>
Cc: Jill Carter <jill.carter@senate.mo.gov>; Cowling, Shawn (Hawley) <shawn_cowling@hawley.senate.gov>
Subject: Smart meter fee assessed on a disabled household Federal citation case

External email

Dear Mr. Or Mrs. Gagliano; Spire Corporate
<http://emfsafetynetwork.org/tag/lawsuit/>

I have made several phone calls in advance in approx. 2021 to make a verbal agreement by phone with your official authorized Agent whom I spoke with numerous times. Her name is a matter of record that will be requested under the freedom of Information act if necessary, as of yet it is not voluntarily being provided. I spoke today with customer service Frank, then asked to go higher to his supervisor whose name I noted who as a final request agreed to have a person above her named Megan e-mail me.

I do not have time to waste waiting for response. The matter is urgent and requires escalation to corporate. Your firm is charging a disabled person a fee to send someone out to read his analog meter. The reason, I didn't see this coming is your firm had upon placing the analog meter verbally agreed there would NEVER be a fee to check it as

the household member as disabled would not medically be viable to install a smart meter without sustaining EMF harm impact. Therefore, he is as a disabled person protected by unlawful surcharges against a disabled person. Please review the Federal citation case as EMF is guidelines to FCC under that statutory the cases have already been wrought to conclude EMF is harmful to the disabled specifically, they are sensitive to this type of radio frequency emission.

The unit in STL; St. Louis, MO has a Facebook page and are diligently working with our MO legislators to stop smart meters if you are unfamiliar with the group I will fill you in on an aside. Suffice it to say the CFPB will commence an investigation if you continue with this unlawful service fee.

My legislator Bill White aided several Missourians in having these meters removed from their property in 2021 when the electric firm known as Liberty began putting them on without informed consent. Many who are not disabled however are sensitive nonetheless to these stealth meters.

Please remove the unlawful fee from Mike Avery's account immediately.

His address is 1221 Euclid Ave. Joplin, MO 64801

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Peterson POA
My cell is 417-629-8789



Cc: Connect With Christopher <CGagliano@spireenergy.com>; Darrell, Mark <Mark.Darrell@spireenergy.com>
Subject: RE: Smart meter fee assessed on a disabled household Federal citation case

Hi Elizabeth,

Thank you for your time this afternoon to discuss the Smart Meter Opt-Out fees that have been assessed to Mike Avery's account.

As discussed, it may be a few days before I reach out with further information. Please feel free to contact me directly via phone at 205-639-4084 in the interim as needed.

Thanks,
Vernita R.
Spire Community Services Department

From: Buffy Peterson <BuffyPeterson@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 6:20 PM
To: Darrell, Mark <Mark.Darrell@spireenergy.com>
Cc: Connect With Christopher <CGagliano@spireenergy.com>
Subject: Fw: Smart meter fee assessed on a disabled household Federal citation case

Dear Mark Darrell as the Recognized Chief Legal Compliance Officer for Spire I have enclosed a 4 pg. formal letter that finalizes my considerate approach to my previous request of your firm on Aug. 15th 2023 that has still gone under review with no outcome or response updates.

My letter is extensive and breaks down all the bullet point incidentals that your firm's position seems to think is legal and upheld by and the state so called Tariff's regulatory.... I hope everyone at Spire has enjoyed their financial gain as they hijacked the consumer personal funds. This type of indiscretion seems to support riding on the backs of the low-income Disabled Individuals who cannot put these stupid smart meters on their homes for Meritorious medical reasons. These vulnerable folks have legitimate medical conditions that prohibit them from slapping on a smart meter. For example, this named party lives in thin walled a 1950's home and your firm wanted to put a smart meter on the outside bedroom wall at the head board area of the bed! The way in which our legislators originally started to be helping this individual with the opt out was appreciated and honorable. However, even though the disabled individual was allowed to keep the analog meter it was not so honorable when Spire's hierarchy staff as a firm representative made verbal promissory to never access fee as we can see now that guarantee was not honored by Spire in the end.

LEGISLATORS this is a Federal and a state issue. I do see Michigan is ready to stop this madness as they roll out Bill HB4220 to allow the consumer to keep their analog meter and completely opt out of the smart switch gambit this legislation includes to STOPPING the fees.
c- link below for this bill in actions updates



Thanks,
Vernita R.
Spire Community Services Department

From: Buffy Peterson <buffypeterson@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 6, 2023 2:09 PM
To: Connect With Christopher <CGagliano@spireenergy.com>; Darrell, Mark <Mark.Darrell@spireenergy.com>
Cc: Cowing, Shawn (Hawley) <shawn_cowing@hawley.senate.gov>
Subject: Re: Smart meter fee assessed on a disabled household Federal citation case

Hi Vernita,
I did want to get your legal folks the exacts of the ADA and other discrimination laws that are applicable. I believe the ADA Federal government code is 11135 that regards the disabled/medical condition.
P.S. Also, if Spire accepted Federal grant funds for Obama's smart grid grants that is a government program so an opt-out medical reason again would be discrimination suit.
Thank you for organizing all the retro charges that were illegally billed.

It was very nice talking to you, too
Elizabeth Peterson,
Get Outlook for IQS

From: Connect With Christopher <CGagliano@spireenergy.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 5:51 PM
To: Buffy Peterson <BuffyPeterson@hotmail.com>

Cc: Connect With Christopher <CGagliano@spireenergy.com>; Darrell, Mark <Mark.Darrell@spireenergy.com>
Subject: RE: Smart meter fee assessed on a disabled household Federal citation case

Hi Elizabeth,

Thank you for your time this afternoon to discuss the Smart Meter Opt-Out fees that have been assessed to Mike Avery's account.

As discussed, it may be a few days before I reach out with further information. Please feel free to contact me directly via phone at 205-639-4084 in the interim as needed.

Thanks,
Vernita R.
Spire Community Services Department



The fact is as I see it you owe this individual a refund of nearly \$500.00 as the retro of the unlawful charges started this last November. If you do not cease and desist with these forward going fees a Discrimination case of civil action will commence.

It truly saddens me that there are 2 FB groups I belong to with similar stories to tell those entail some individuals with less than an 8th grade education who do not know how to stop your smart meter rules

which were inflicted upon them and on their home even though they are disabled they could not risk the fee threat encumberment your firm uses as a tactic. This is truly a systemic issue in Missouri and it is a National Issue as well.

This is my due diligence to notify your Firm at which point if this is not resolved by the deadline included in the Letter, I will have to pursue civil action against your Firm.

Sincerely,
Consumer Representative; Elizabeth Peterson POA
Cell 417-629-8789

From: Connect With Christopher <CGagliano@spireenergy.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2023 4:37 PM
To: Buffy Peterson <BuffyPeterson@hotmail.com>; Connect With Christopher <CGagliano@spireenergy.com>
Subject: RE: Smart meter fee assessed on a disabled household Federal citation case

Hi Elizabeth,

Thanks for reaching out to us. We appreciate the opportunity to serve you.

Our team is reviewing the information below regarding the meter upgrade opt-out for Mike Avery. I will respond with further information once the review has been completed.

Thanks so much for working with us.

Thanks,
Vernita R.
Spire Community Service Department



From: Luetkemeyer, Matt Matt.Luetkemeyer@dfs.dps.mo.gov

To: Buffypeterson@hotmail.com

Date: Tue, Jun 18, 2024, 9:11 AM

Mrs. Peterson,


Thank you for contacting the Division of Fire Safety with your concerns. We did receive your original email to Representative Roberts on Friday morning, June 14, 2024. We have noted your concerns and are researching this topic. I, personally, was unaware of the grounding issues with these devices and will be doing some more studying about them.

I hope that the Missouri Public Service Commission can shed some more light on this for you as well.

Respectfully,

Matt

Matthew J. Luetkemeyer
Assistant State Fire Marshal



Missouri Division of Fire Safety
Missouri Department of Public Safety
Jefferson State Office Building
205 Jefferson St., Suite 1315
P.O. Box 844
Jefferson City, MO 65102
Office: (573) 751-1743
Mobile: (573) 301-5315
Fax: (573) 751-5710
[How are we doing? \(Click Here\)](#)

X New Message

buffypeterson@hotmail.com

ATTN: City Planner **here is the model city template <https://www.bradytx.us/974/Advanced-Meter-Information-and-forms-for-Citizen-informed-consent-to-install-Advanced-meter>.

ATTN: Fire Chief & Building inspector** here are all the white papers on SMPS and the experts contact information for Officials in need of clarification after fully reviewing Bill's white papers; he can be reached.

Bill Bathgate
734 627 1083 landline

fire Here's the file "Evaluation of the Aolara 1-210.C AMI Meter v1.3.pdf" for your review: <https://acrobat.adobe.com/dum/raaid:scus4e13ca271-dca2-4e7b-d09-d957dda213e1> I enclosed the Screenshot that explains why the smart meters are melting and that came from this file's supporting facts.

Just last month near Chicago a report from WGN Chicago news describes how complaints have been going on for 10 years now. These just cost the man \$4,500 for one that melted. The Utility Vendors won't pay this it's burden on the homeowner if they don't get their house burned down and if they are not harm injured by the fire safety aspect they are financially burdened by the FIRE hazard aspect.

<https://youtu.be/xBbba09kC7si> = K5gH1MwXmWESS3UP Video is 4 minutes and or here direct link to WGN

Thank you

Elizabeth Peterson
417-629-8789

From: Buffy Peterson <buffypeterson@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 25, 2025 11:58 PM

To: matt.luetkemeyer@dfs.mo.gov <matt.luetkemeyer@dfs.mo.gov>; Charles Thomas <Charles.Thomas@usdoj.gov>; Wolfe, Alexis <alexis.wolfe@ago.mo.gov>; Wilbur, Emily



X

Case Jurisdiction Diagnosis for State F 1 of 5

CASE EC-2026-0150 Elizabeth Peterson POA

Scope approach

The list of Responses are forthcoming wanted to get some off the checklist

Party Status is Caregiver and POA for Disabled Individual who is mostly homebound.

Liberty has not provided qualified assurance of Safe ANALOG which is an ADA accommodation for health concerns. That is the one law violated that in fact other Utility Vendors found Intention to hold their own jurisdiction over ADA within their own framework. The request I made of Liberty is not without proper time impossible for me to carry out like I did with Spire two years ago. The negotiation with Spire began in early Sept. 2023 and once we they received the formal complaint I requested response within two months so that they could make their best attempt to not be rushed. In the end the template I've enclosed was recommended by that Vendor to best be brought before PSC. They did not give me more than one day to gather the medical information they requested and it was insufficient.

The relevance of this Spire oriented Vendor submission is in that I did make effort to discuss with Liberty to do an ADA accommodation. Yet, it was made aware that their desire was to present with Tribunal immediately at threat of removal of my ANALOG meter which is not causing any danger?? The Liberty describes they are out of ANALOGS. That is okay I can wait until they locate one. That is what I require for the ADA accommodation with PSC oversight to keep everyone amicable. The minute Liberty removes the ANALOG they are literally committing a change medically speaking and that is the ADA violation. It is only relevant to note that Tribunal exists to make services that are compliant despite jurisdiction the observation of Vendors delegation has to be observed as was why the other outcome ended abruptly and without sounding repetitive the other Vendor said this matter would be the type of matter to be best handled by Tribunal. So, if there is a different Commission that Tribunal wishes to eventually transfer this case it was recommended that Human Rights commission would be suitable. The role of Consumer and Utility Vendor complaints are in general handled by PSC, yet I did not understand that Spire was mistaken to refer this type of case to PSC? It sounds like in general the Vendors needs a system in place for ADA accommodation. But, where the state jurisdictions lies could be elsewhere. However, the other matters I have not had time to bring into would avert the ADA perhaps altogether. I just need to qualify that my efforts are meritorious and that I will submit that new complaint in time to allow Liberty to respond. Pending how the ADA is going according to Liberty's turn to respond.

The factor of ADA is something that perhaps could be integrated with MO PSC as to provide the means necessary for ADA compliance of the Utility Vendors who do feel that the current Tariff is permissive in this Liberty case matter to uphold that there not an accommodation request for an ADA Analog to remain as the meter.

The medical part on this can be separately addressed, but to skip that for now I need to put into place a current moratorium of safe equipment removal. The Liberty told Jay Eastlick that according to their current Tariff they can opt for an advanced meter alternative. This would violate ADA law.

The CSR 4240-10.025 rule making hearing as a matter of public record defined via an Expert in person with EMR credentials which substantiated my claim that the non RF Advanced meter is actually emitting what is termed as a transient also called more commonly D.E. dirty electricity. There are two types of EMF one is ELF fields from electrical bleed off as D.E. dirty electricity. The other is RF radiation. Liberty is attempting to place a non RF Advanced meter which emits ELF as synthetic EMF; electromagnetic frequency which is very harmful to health.

The other point is the Advanced meters are also a safety hazard.

The response to what entities of the state are involved in founded evidence on this safety hazard of Advanced meters is MO Division of Fire Ast. Chief Matt Luetkemeyer and the other State Entity is General Hanaway's Office.

The re address on this with Fire Division is noted on pg. E 1 & 2. The initial prior outreach to the Division this is noted. The current outreach is on pg. E 2 and that e-mail went to Fire and also to Hanaway's Office assigned person Alexis Wolfe. The fact is both a fire investigatory is being looked over they just received the 4 packets of white pages from the highly credible retired DOD and Engineer with years of research and international UL industry background. The white papers take time for these state investigators to review. As far as Hanaway's that would be for product recall. The one Senator's Chief of Staff who is checking in with those folks is Senator Moon's. So, I would in the meantime be founded with grounds to refuse any Advanced meter substitute for the ANALOG on the disabled persons home is actually fully functional and it is not capable of being a fire hazard due to the type of componentry and that is described extensively in those white papers which have been provided by a Scientific Engineer so to speak. The fire hazard is grounds for formal refusal to be compromised by removal of the safe functioning ANALOG that is not a health harm and not capable of causing fire hazard and shock.

The State as an ENTITY of all aspects of this particular Case matter has been required as the units of function are part of the whole. The right for my discovery was based on allowing time for the addressing properly of health and safety and ADA is actually already accommodated with the ANALOG so it is not on our end as the claimant that is dissatisfied. It is Liberty's determination to take a safe home environment and make it a hazard for health and and for safety. So, at this point the other things that are in the jurisdiction if Liberty so chooses is to conduct similar to what Spire was doing whereby Liberty can request Medical reasons if necessary why the ANALOG is medically approved and would make a condition worse due to the EMF. These are the things I asked of Spire and yet they got in a one day rush to have my medical information when I just barely got their letter requesting that information.

So, the role that ALJ would be good as jurisdiction is to continue to let Liberty fulfill all the needs of ADA that their Interior legal staff wants and of course make sure I get the correct amount of time necessary to provide those medical requests. And to overcome any objections in a manner that is not dismissive towards these specifications. To allow me time for any clarity they feel lacks etc.

The other role of jurisdiction is to address the Fire Safety when your other state Agencies feel they have proper time to render those.

The additional state entity that might need called upon would of course be Chief Medical Stanasiagh she has worked on prior medical input for the need to understand often take an Agency of that field to interpret and convey reports and substantiate the queries of quandaries of the Utility Vendors as they analyze medical information. But, I never got that chance with Spire. Fortunately, they do not want to remove our Analog so that is all I really need from them as a Vendor.

The new additional complaint I already provided to Liberty prior to the case submission however it did not get in the initial submission. I will retrieve that and add the statutes that are violated on that issue prior to Jan. 6th. But, I did want to get the bulk of the response in to be timely.

X

Case Diagnosis of Current claim

RTF-30 KB

CASE DIAGNOSIS OF CURRENT SITUATION OF JURISDICTION FOR ALL

Recognizing the States' Public Service Commissions' classification with the Federal Governing Agency in an appointed role declared to place Advanced Meter complaints upon States' PSC or in some states PUC, Public Utility Commissions.

Relative as to intergovernmental affairs STATE-FEDERAL relations.

The rationale of citation of the new rule CSR 4240-10.035 regarding of when it becomes effective my request to submit that rule as evidence is per the rule making hearing so for certification on my evidence is the exhibition if you will review that video or read the transcript on the which it already a record of PSC's possession as factual urgent interplay to this case matter with Liberty per it is not the discretion of Tribunal to not address in an expounded manner the Health relevance of that change being assigned to State Public Service Commission as the delegated party by the Federal Agency known as the FCC.

It is therefore, by those findings of now in particular the MO entity as the PSC entity to be required full scope claimants through intergovernmental affairs state mentioned.

So, it would be now in reference to where the validity of those multi-level of Federal and State hold a sitting that between the MO PSC and the FCC. These two agencies one Federal one State have been prior determined by Congress to place keep on these exact equipment the initial change keep of the specified Advanced meters? However the one keep the factor of the intricacies of the particulars of the Liberty's extended product as a quote NON RIF version as a by product has never been tested by the FCC in the first place. So, therein the type of EMF we are discussing is a like all outside the normal EMF that FCC has tested which is the wireless version known as the ADVANCED METER specifically smart meter wireless (cellular wireless).

The substance model according to its relationship to its type of EMF as type described was noted in my initial general disclaimer on page ZERO submitted first as in keeping with order of operations I cannot go forward specifically until we declare the non RIF variant model to my knowledge completely untested by the FCC.

So, that is why I must expound upon the new rule making hearing records of fact introduced in that hearing as worthy of request for review by Liberty as well as this case matter need of ALL assigned Judge Clark. That reference is required in order to bring the in person expert of record Robert Workman whose credentials can be further provided to file cases ALL just as my PDA was necessary. There is not a step that I am trying to work around. That is why it is now that they reported that to the Informal Regulatory manager Jay Eastick and Liberty said that so that is already submitted to PSC that is what I'm trying to request that there begin a Tribunal so that these two points can be examined how the interplay of SAFE equipment can be presented properly to the Tribunal again in order of operations I am trying to not rush the valid entry of the Rule making hearing trial is current as existing evidence it regard to whether or not the CSR 20-4240-10.035's applicability. It would be best to let me now substitute the purpose of mandating that this is to utilize the specifics of record already submitted and on this so that I can be able now to render the context of that New Rule is to remind that the process of that promulgation has already been completed as far as the significance of a hearing of public record held by PSC in which the Party involved in this Tribunal case matter can utilize these findings as relevant evidence of facts provided that are extremely crucial and are already provided to all parties and the ALL Judge to reference in my position as the claimant. That is of record as of 0X-2026-0045 and that is going to cover several of these layers of why I maintained the New Rule pendence as necessary to expound upon. Within that 0X-2026-0045 is sufficient payments that presented as to why the party as Liberty would need to review the safety of this Tribunal case matter in regard to the surface scratching of that model as the NON RIF model as it is the proposed model that Liberty declared to PSC, Jay Eastick Informal case matter as appropriate under current Tribunal rules as quote an opt out meter as an alternative SAFE model health safe model option per the consists of that Tarif that Liberty quoted gave them just cause to install it upon the premise of the assessment of the dwelling of this my disabled persons home dwelling.

So, again the 0X-2026-0045 was reviewed by the Informal PSC complaint personal Regulatory Coordinator Manager but he does not go into law aspects so that is why the ALL and the Tribunal were required to these proceedings.

The relevance of that 0X-2026-0045 under direction of ALL Henry Dipiel saw fit to allow and to allow to present my side of why the NON RIF Advanced meter specificity's are already inappropriate due to EMF that is non-hazardous EMF that by Robert Workman whose credentials can be further provided to file cases ALL just as my PDA was necessary. There is not a step that I am trying to work around. That is why it is now finally in this case presentation to ALL and Liberty as the both notes are being defined as to why this matter is to be resolved in this Tribunal as the proper course of due process.

So, why do need to clarify that in that record of fact during the 48-minute the my testimony specifically in relationship to MO PSC's role delegated by FCC to this these types of EMF concerns as the FCC does not take the complaints for this specific product directly from the Consumer that Congress tirelessly with our STATE Public Service Commission. I need to have my testimony reviewed by ALL Judge Clark as it goes into the surface scratch of why FCC has already appointed these products complaints come from myself as the Consumer to your State Entity specifically rather than the Human Rights Commission as the order of operations. With a health concern factoring pre-requisite it is already pre-determined how to proceed with a Consumer complaint on Advanced Meter. That next step in layers will state ALL Judge back to prior years of Direct Communications on that pre-designated role by the FCC. So, before we open into that aspect it would be best to remind that everything I am stating is well documented in e-mails phone calls and that was in direct communication with the Liaison at the time Doug Anderson. That aspect I will be graciously awaiting when to expound upon as I want to give the ALL Judge Clark adequate time to review the rule making hearing and determine how to go into the FULL SCOPE of the intergovernmental STATE FEDERAL affairs that also transpired during Doug Anderson's Liaison role. So, in doing that and to proceed with introducing the Federal partnering party I will need to be sure that Tribunal first accepts their role as FCC defined it with Congress.

I will be happy to elaborate on that role as it was presented to me personally and with the Consumer side of the FCC and it is in their website what jurisdictions they leave to the STATE AGENCY on UTILITY Regulation of these Advanced meters as the definition of STATE jurisdiction is defined by FCC.

So, to recap I went over the role of PSC MO with the Liaison in 2024 when I was attempting to submit via my role as a Consumer complaint to PSC in a systemic level matter that is occurring on a National level scale due to the current EMF's international disease epidemic. The role of EMF equipment was assigned by Congress to the FCC however when Utility Vendor's decided to integrate it into their equipment since that toxic elimination known to cause the EMF epidemic was not presented adequately by Congress to the States and therefore the States are actually operating with said ADVANCED meter equipment under Federal Jurisdiction FCC Agency. The point of fact here is that the FCC is currently under the arm of Medical Branch of Government based on a direct case I can clearly in due time. But, that case's relevance is applicable to why the FCC is actually already in violation of a D.C. Federal Appellate Circuit Court Judge and was thereby ordered to answer to the 11,000 while pages on HEALTH related injury from the EMF guidelines inadequacy to provide



X

Case Diagnosis of Current claim
RTF - 30 KB

FCC to actually identify in distinction of a D.C. Federal Appeals Circuit Court Judge and was thereby ordered to answer to the 1,000+ written pages on HEALTH related injury from the EMF guidelines inadequacy to provide proper safety guidelines on these ADVANCED motors as well as other TELECOM equipment which is not part of this case matter current relevance until that which is necessary. But the point is the FCC is in abatement of a Federal Judge and has been continuing to operate nonchalant without proper scrutiny of Congress. The last Side Contaminant hearing that FCC was brought in for I can elaborate if needed. But let me say it takes time to make sure that our STATE understands the role of the PSC was in fact put into the delegation change loop of MO PSC.

Let me return to addressing why the evidences that transpired during the role of Doug Anderson as a witness to these OX-2026-0045 might help shed some light upon this case matter and so first is where those correspondences would be already in the records of the PSC as part of my earlier attempts to require that rather than take the Spire Case into the Tribunal I would under the Full Scope of the STATE as a body and gather my Legislators and bring into PSC Liaison the Biggie picture of the role of MO PSC as designated by Congress.

The other entity at the Federal level that has been extremely diligent and highly cooperative is the intergovernmental Affairs for State-Federal if you will is US WIDMID AAG Environmental Counsel; Charles Thomas and fortunately he does hold some enforcement on our State as one of his regions. So it is with that being said I would like to further expound at some point when the initial layer of the OX-2026-0045 Rule making hearing has been achieved by the MO PSC ALJ Judge Clark assigned to this case as well as the Liberty Attorney Cooper. These requests are for comprehension and understanding as reasonable to develop the strengths of why this Tribunal as the designated FCC state Entity may or may not be able to transfer out to the Human Rights Commission for the ADA violations that are occurring in this case matter. The alternate decision could be to transfer this case to the decision of the Federal DOJ who actually hold enforcement. I am working actively with attempting to get the Governor's Office Intergovernmental Liaison and the AG MO to accept the offer that K.C. DOJ is willing to make direct outreach with them in order to perhaps position the ADA law into State level implementation so that the role of the ALJ Tribunal will no longer need that jurisdiction and that would be accomplished by allowing the current waiver or exception process to match with ADA Federal policy integrated into STATE Commission's role of compliance on the ADA policy. There are not distractions to this case matter these remedies for the Tribunal to not have to declare the understandable incapacity feeling of constraints to serve as Judgment on ADA as the requirements of the ALJ is limited. The other options to bring this Tribunal to a construct that will fit the same realm of Safety standards that would equal to my ADA complaint role. Would be to allow Tribunal ALJ Judge Clark proper time and evaluation with the other entities how so far that can contribute to how to make a means test that won't be challenged by the US DOJ as less than adequate as substitute for ADA waiver that currently is not in place with MO PSC per unit of that Federal Compliance matter. I could submit this case in CA whereby that PUC Public Utility Commission did that putting that place of an ADA waiver so to speak in order to remedy the Unrest of a non profits complaint that was made on a larger scale with a Judicial Branch of Government that was not Administrative in orientation. But I am not trying to subject the MO PSC to that type of Judicial Branch which is not Administrative in nature.

My position and approach with MO PSC prior to this case I used has always been through Administration function of Governmental courses of due process. That is a goal and record history that we can continue to bring that discovery for evaluation and relevance accordingly but again. The first steps in order of operations is to try and find where the PSC Tribunal claim and the ALJ Jurisdiction are being diagnosed as we ALL parties involved are not able to request our limitations would constrain the safety to make a Judgment on Safety issues and Health issues and also I have now attempted to introduce that Federal Congress assigned the FCC through the State level Public Commissioners to manage these equipments complaints on Health and safety.

The other portion of ALJ Jurisdiction that I need to convey at this juncture is that I cannot put hyper links and power points within the framework so that is why I would hold that PSC is in charge keep of utilizing the OX-2026-0045 hearing on record. If there is a transcript that I am supposed to request from that meeting so that I can in turn submit the transcript I need advised to do so as an expectation of Judge Clark or Liberty. Yet even though I will go that distance as the complainants duty to submit evidence it does seem that that hearing would be justified to conclude as already on record with Judge Clark with video as well aspects whichever is preferred. Perhaps I am misusing my role here is to provide evidence and yet I am utilizing several state Entities which have co-occurring roles to play for case submission. So, I would presume that I will need to add by parts of the entities of the state Liaisons' responsibilities to provide clearly into submission on my request to at this point create a sort of subpoena methodology? Please know that the venue of this Tribunal as the FCC set it up is to require the STATE to take these equipments Consumer complaint.

If I could expound just one more elaboration of the Role of past evidences of working on the File matter of safety and now with re-address I did also initiate with both MO AG and MO DNR the same concerns of EMF radiation which the charge keep from FCC force placed my complaint upon the state and directly on MO PSC who I felt during the role of PSC Liaison Doug Anderson I did my best to provide to PSC any other state entities corresponding role in regards to safety. Those Officials from DNR and MO AG at that time I have offered up signed letters in regard to needing help from the Federal jurisdiction. I can produce those two letters if needed. What I am trying to say is to take my complaint with PSC Tribunal in regards to State seemed to me to require safety constitutional concerns being gathered first to present to an ALJ Tribunal Judge at PSC that otherwise there would not be adequate time. Which is sort of what I am feeling pressured to do now. I am trying to present a full SCOPE case matter that is delegated by the FCC to be handled by The STATES' public services Commissions and finding that the ADA implementation by MO PSC would provide a means by which the Case could be properly handled by the PSC ALJ Jurisdiction. Yet until PSC itself comes into that ADA compliance, it would still be a simpler case matter to reduce the ADA element to a more broad stroke effort by the ALJ Judge so I would please me for Judge Clark to be able to let me lead that construct per my position as the claimant role.

If we address the safety issue on Health and Fire with our own state Evaluations perhaps the FCC is more to use their safety guidelines as reference as we narrow the scope of just the actual Advanced Meter known as a NON RF Meter that we can address from the EMF experts diagnosis as harmful EMF of a specific synthetic nature. The definition is due to the aforementioned fact which is the type of EMF as an ELF not an RF radiation. Therefore if we narrow down the scope of this exact model's classification of radiation known as EMF ELF we can address this model specifically as deemed to be just as harmful as the RF meters which under current laws these NON RF were wrongfully classified by Liberty who presented in my understanding to the PSC that these are not smart meters and somewhat repaired the misconception that as a reflective fact of conclusion. Which I certainly disputed in that in the time constraints my expert was under in person at the OX-2026-0045 hearing. But it was can just utilize that Experts evidence and also the ongoing Fire issues I think we can without need of ADA law which is not current ALJ Judge Clark's jurisdiction we can move into a standpoint of challenging the presumption that Liberty should be permitted by MO PSC to install an SAPE Advanced meter from RF model per statutory values of EMF ELF radiation toxicity and Fire hazard inherent traits of all Advanced Meters so that will encompass that the non RF Advanced meter has an inherent trait of fire hazard and shock capabilities. Those founded evidences are currently in the hands of other state entity but if this case needs immediate direct submission of those while papers and power points I would need to ask for some IT assistance in order to render these evidences which were presented in person to my Local Level Jurisdiction of government that to be considered founded prior to my submitting these investigations requests with Fire Division and AG MO. These are also in the hands of the Intergovernmental STATE FEDERAL AIRFRAPS of the Enforcement at Federal Intergovernmental level if need with US DOJ WIDMID AAG that is Environmental Counsel specific Division. Perhaps they could also outreach to FCC should ALJ request anything in regards to the facts that I adhered to at the Federal Judicial Branch abatement of a Judge by the FCC all that evidence is held by the DOJ's aforementioned.



X

Case Diagnosis of Current claim
RTF - 30 KB

F 4 of 5

To expand just one more fraction of the FCC's complaints that were able to be made as a non-Consumer that Administrative Complaint on EIAF safety regulations faulty and Congressman Hawkins office complained that Administrative review complained to FCC based on findings of fact by while papers and filed hearing done in STL MO by the same EMR Expert who is on record in person at the said State making hearing. So that reliance on Congress to correct what a Federal Judge has not been able to correct weighs heavily in the facts that even though our Federal Government has failed to protect the Consumer from EIAF and Advanced meters EMS. Evidence there is jurisdiction that my State Senators are trying to apply in the meantime and that's why the state constructs of limitations is not an excuse for our State Government as a Body to not FULL SCOPE multi-laterally investigate what is brought into our state and question the lack of due diligence to hear from within the state myself and others in other states trying to require data process in order to resolve Consumer protections.

My status have been earnest and they have been Administrative and I would see very much to be able to lead ALJ Judge despite the constraints by giving advisory from FULL SCOPE objective observations of why in fact the FCC is not taking this complaint directly and has delegated that your Entity is supposed to handle these claims. FCC is spending its time taking complaints on Call Trainers EIAF etc. But, they did not feel that had to take directly Consumer complaints on Advanced meters EIAF health facility claims matters. So what they are minding the Telecom Vendors they tell that your role as Utility oversight of the said equipment which is telecom in nature but utilized by Utility Vendors in integrational equipment. It's there that the core delinquency occurred.

Secondly, since it did occur that is why the DOJ has to have enforcement that the State follow ADA or i.e. health and safety concerns of complainants in a manner that is up to the state but must consider the same factors as ADA which is what is appropriate for safety and health of the disabled person with conditions that are aggravated by EIAF regardless of the Scope of the FCC who is supposed to be in charge of that EIAF portion the FCC actually never tested the non RF Advanced meter which is the one that is being proposed by Liberty so we do have some wiggle room to determine the safety thresholds of the stated exact Liberty designated alternate substitute they are proposing or asking would be just or valid as SAFE equipment. Since they are proposing it under their tariff opt out regulations submitted to Jay Eastick in the internal that information is already submitted in the preliminary internal complaint response from Liberty, so that is what I was referencing as the Tariff I was not the one who obligated the MO PSC under that Tariff to allow Liberty to submit any disabled person or myself as standards of the General Public person biologically speaking to their insistence to put that Tariff into play as a weapon utilized in a manner that is purporting to be under their rights within that Tariff that is an agreement Vendors have with MO PSC.

And so, I will leave it at that juncture because this proponent is exactly the crux of why regardless of any ADA ALJ jurisdiction there is an blocker opening that is in regard to CHOICES in that Tariff being cited to Jay Eastick in the preliminary process of the Internal to convey an inaccurate assertion and exercise it without first addressing that right to exercise Liberty's supposition made to PSC which leads us to a very general aspect of that Tariff that ALJ does have I assure jurisdiction to rule upon. That was not in my first submission as I was misled as I explained in my request for an extension on time to bring in not actually new facts but actually to finally get around to bringing in rebuttal to that initial wrongful assertion and wrongful interpretation of the Liberty which I did in fact lead to Nate Harkney their lead Consumer relations Manager who was conveying to Liberty legal division. Since they failed to acknowledge that rebuttal it will need to be brought in as it was there strongest weaponry used by taking a vintage point in the Tariff that has been due to jurisdiction of Internal Complaint the response by Liberty that was in attempt to gain confidence of the MO PSC to also side with that interpretation and vintage point that is where the ALTERNATE way to handle this matter will be taken up in a back up measure manner. But firstly and in order of operations the Case must distinguish that in fact of ADA it is my position to proceed with general standards of safety pertinent to Fire hazard and EIAF toxic exposure since the type of EIAF is not wireless on the exact item it has been tested by the FCC specifically I would lead ALJ to determine the only testing was already performed by the EMR Expert at the stated time making hearing and that from there well the state needs to require Liberty to find their evidence as to their claim that the non RF Advanced meter does not emit EIAF ELF and give them time to dispute that expert. Liberty will also need to prove to ALJ that they can prove with investigation from Liberty. There cannot be any other quick suitable approach until we establish safety and health concerns in a manner that is fair I will understand if Liberty requires a couple of months or more. This would have been perhaps through any my choice to address the frames. But since we are not currently in a state of emergency to where the current ANLACG is fully functional it is not a fire hazard and it is not a health hazard as it does not emit toxicity and that is in the whole papers provided to to the two entities mentioned in my request or extended time so that those entities as indicated parties of investigatory for my discovery must have adequate time. The other entity is the person who made those claims, peers as he would be willing to be an additional expert in this particular case matter and he can address the reason why the competency rendered a UL listing despite the claims that he inherited to cause the. The UL standard have some intricacies that do not mandate UL which is a private entity by the way to address this facility security components. That is one of the first questions the Fire State of MO wanted to address with the Expert and his white papers. The power point I made and presented to my Local level Building Inspector Director was another concern for the STATE Fire Division as I asked that they would turn this over to our STATE Building Inspector Division only to find that Act. State Fire Chief said, told me that the state omitted this unit so he has lack of that need and aspect of the way the heat on the lines goes into the building wiring which is an endpoint of considerable threat of fire investigation that is hazard to pin down as the culprit of the Advanced meter's heat created and generated as a proponent of the D.E. Only Society aspect of these with power mode supplies as they are nothing like what is supposed to be used in electrical fields of main wiring entrance to the home main power lines. This is another aspect of the fire hazard of the equipment. But, like the stated it is all in the power point and evidences turned over to the two entities at this time. I was not wanting to mandate the Tribunal or the Liberty attorney with these investigations that are occurring to bring outcome to my claims of Fire hazard. So, in that is my role I would assume it is also the role of Liberty on their own to begin their own methods of research and vendor why track constraints and these Advanced meters to be safe and to be not plausible as being the hazardous in nature due to their inherent traits.

The need to remain in the respond date of Jan. 31st if there is please the ALJ Judge a moment to let this much be achieved and then give me another deadline or whatever before expecting results to help substantiate the claims. I would further please me that ALJ Judge would permit his state to as a whole address this safety fire concern and if seeking proof the investigation request is founded that would require me to ask my LOCAL level meeting with 4 entities thereof. Could please be able to take a breath and be concise as GOOD FAITH meeting that it there is doubt of my research for these claims I present that being able to adhere to all of them in one fall swoop would be again, like I feel I would be amending the case with these as every mail-level aspect where the state is leading which includes reports I gave to the not only the FCC via Congressman Harkney but also to the EPA regional Director in K.C. but all in all I am mandatory to provide the general role of each layer of these multiple courts of weight and merit of governmental Agencies who compromised the Regulatory that afflicted our STATE's decision to allow deployment of these Advanced meters without proper HIA from NEPA. I will go into all of why they are here rather than acknowledge that my Senate desire is to implement a way to remove them and replace with ANLACG then it that is not mentions as to why also that I need to bring into consideration that we are actually in a process of mitigation through that new Bill Senate #4 inclusion of CSR 4240-1-10.056 in that the right of choice to ANLACG will circumvent in a mitigation approach to remove all those Advanced meters and require Utility Vendor compliance then in the meantime I would present this investigatory means of the hazard and submit that General Harkneys could pursue a product recall. Or the Fire Division could require no new installation under the pending fire investigations preliminary report. At the very least in the meantime I am interceding to try and require our regions DOJ to Contact Governors so that that perhaps on the ADA violation we can find that in fact Liberty is in



X

Case Diagnosis of Current claim

RTF - 30 KB

Secondly, since it did occur that the DOJ has and have enforcement that the State follow ADA or LE health and safety concerns of complainants in a manner that is up to the state but must consider the same factors as ADA which is what is appropriate for safety and health of the disabled person with conditions that are aggravated by EMF regardless of the scope of the FCC who is supposed to be in charge of that EMF portion the FCC actually never tested the non RF Advanced meter which is the one that is being proposed by Liberty so we do have some wiggle room to determine the safety thresholds of the stated exact Liberty designated alternate substitute they are proposing or asking would be just or valid as SAFE equipment. Since they are proposing it under that trail get out regulations submitted to Fey Eastlick in the informal that information is already submitted in the preliminary informal complaint responses from Liberty, so that is what I was referencing as the Tariff I was not the one who objected the MO PSC under that tariff to allow Liberty to subject my disabled person or myself as standards of the General Public person biologically speaking to their insistence to put that tariff into play as a weapon utilized in a manner that is purporting to be under their rights within that Tariff that is an agreement vendors have with MO PSC.

And so, I will leave it at that juncture because the proponent is exactly the exact of why regardless of any ADA ALJ jurisdiction there is an broader opening that is in regard to CHOICES In that Tariff being cited to Jay Eastlick in the preliminary process of the informal to convey an inaccurate assertion and exercise it without first addressing that right to exercise Liberty's suspension made to PSC which leads us to a very general aspect of that Tariff that ALJ does have jurisdiction to rule upon. That was not in my first submission as I was rushed as I explained in my request for an extension on time to bring in not actually new lawsuits but actually to finally get around to bringing in rebuttal to that initial wrongful assertion and wrongful interpretation of the Liberty which I did in fact read to State history that lead Consumer relations Manager with was purporting to Liberty legal division. Since they failed to acknowledge that rebuttal it will need to be brought in as it was there strong suit weaponry used by taking a vantage point in the Tariff that has been done to jurisdiction of informal Complaint the response by Liberty that was an attempt to gain confidence of the MO PSC so also side with that interpretation and vantage point that is where the ALTERNATE way to handle this matter will be taken up in a back up measure manner. But, firstly and in order of operations the Case must distinguish that in fact of ADA & it is my position to proceed with general standards of safety pertinent to Fire hazard and EMF toxic exposure since the type of EMF is not wireless on this exact item it and since it has never been tested by the FCC specifically I would lead ALJ to determine the only testing was already performed by the EMF Expert at the stated rule making meeting and that from there well the state needs to require Liberty to find their evidence as to their claim that the non RF Advanced meter does not emit EMF ELF and give them time to acquire that expert. Liberty will also need to prove to ALJ that they can prove with investigations on their own that the Advance meter is not a Fire and shock hazard. By process of elimination this is the first lawyer course that must be laid in business prior to the Tribunal being able to even support that the Tariff itself contains these evidence I am requiring from Liberty. There cannot be any other quick Jurisprudence approach until two established safety and health concerns in a manner that is fair will understand that Liberty requires a couple of months or more. This would have been perhaps thought not my choice to address time issues. But since we are not currently in a state of emergency so where the current ANA LOG is fully functional it is not a fire hazard and it is not a health hazard as it does not emit toxic and that is in the while papers provided to to the two entities mentioned in my request for extended time so that those entities as indicated paths of investigation for any discovery must have adequate time. The other entity is the person who made those while papers as he would be willing to be an additional expert in this particular case matter and he can address the reason why the company received a UL listing despite the flaws that are inherent to cause fire. The UL standard have some indications that do not mandate UL which is a private entity by the way to address this faulty circuitry components. That is one of the first questions the Fire State of MO wanted to address with the Expert and the while papers. The power point I made and presented to my Legal level Building Inspector Director was another concern for the STATE Fire Division as I asked that they would like to over to our STATE Building Inspector Division only to find that Asst. State Fire Chief saidy told me that the state could not do so he has lack of that need and aspect of the way the heat or the fire goes into the thermostat which is an oversight of considerable threat of Fire investigation that is harder to pin down as the culprit of the Advanced meters had created and generated as a proportion of the D. E. Dirty Electricity aspect of these smart power mode supplies as they are nothing like what is supposed to be used in electrical fields of mesh wiring entrance to the home main power lines. This is another aspect of the hazard of the equipment. But, like I've stated it is all in the power point and evidence turned over to the two entities at this time. I was not wanting to jump into the Tribunal or the Liberty attorney with these investigations that are occurring to bring outcome to my claims of Fire hazard. So, in that is my role I would assume it is also the role of Liberty on their own to begin their own methods of research and render why their consultants find these Advanced meters to be safe and to be not plausible as highly fire hazardous in nature due to their inherent flaws.

The need to remain to the respond date of Jan. 8th if there is please the ALJ Judge's moment to let this much be adhered and then give me another deadline or whatever before expiring results to help substantiate the claims. It would further please me that ALJ Judge would permit his state to as a wrote address this safety fire concern and if seeking proof the investigation request is founded that would require me to let my LOCAL level meeting with 4 entities thereof. Could I please be able to take a breath and be conducted as GOOD FAITH meaning that if there is doubt of my research for these claims I present that I am able to adhere to all of them in case all steps would be again like I feel I would be enhancing this case with these myriad of toxic at every multi-level aspect where the state is taking which includes reports I gave to the nation the FCC via Congressman Hawley but also to the EPA regional Director in KC, but all in all if I am mandatory to provide the general role of each layer of these multiple courts of weight and need of governmental Agencies with compromised the Regulatory that afflicted our STATE's decision to allow deployment of these Advanced meters without proper HIA from NEPA. If we go into all of why they are here rather than acknowledge that my Senators desire is to implement a way to remove them and replace with ANA LOG then, if that is not feasible as to why also that I need to bring into consideration that we are actually in a process of mitigation through this new Bill Senate Act inclusion of CSR 4240-10.035 in that the right of choice to ANA LOG will determine a mitigation approach to remove all these Advanced meters and require Utility Vendor compliance then in the meantime I must present the investigatory means of fire hazard and submit that General Hawley could pursue a product recall. Or the Fire Division could require new installation under the pending fire investigations preliminary report. At the very least in the meantime I am indicating to try and regulate our regional DOJ to Contact Governors so that they perhaps on the ADA violation we can find that in fact Liberty is in violation of medical need to accommodate with ANA LOG on their stand alone by also enforcing with MO PSC from the federal arm to permit your ALJ role to first consider that the Tariff cited by Liberty is void of ADA waiver exemption and as ALJ would require that acknowledgment on my behalf as to how to proceed as a Commissioner to bring the matter in immediately through intergovernmental relations which is actually within the DOJ is ready to reach out to the other at Governors and AGMO to see the best approach in application of those intergovernmental STATE FEDERAL AFFAIRS. It has always been the role of DOJ to intervene in an emergency and since this Tribunal reviews around an ADA matter it requires that Tribunal recognize the role of the watch keep of industry equipment did to these new Advanced meters as complainants worthy of ADA accommodations asked etc. It is therefore beyond a discrimination matter which is my leading to ALJ Judge to see my position in the past was to try and handle the vendors on my own since that failed with Spive and since they too as a Vendor concluded these matters are your Agency responsibility to limitations or jurisdiction work around whatever approach necessary to resolve as the design ENTITY by FCC which is via Congress. So, again although I understand the protections comparable if you will let me lead in the proper more equitable manner of deny the nature of the general public like myself for safety first and health first equipment and that is why my Legalists worked so hard to bring realization of the unconstitutional aspects of the Tariff being cited by Liberty in their preliminary informal complaint to be directed to Tribunal as the pinpoint of setting these Consumer complaint matters in the best manner within the constraints of ALJ jurisdiction.

