

GLOSSARY of items

- Pg.A 1 of1 Append to use of improper implication of wording of ELF
 Definition of ELF low is not indicative of strength of EMF
- Pg. B 1-2 Readdress on Conference hearing transcript pg 40 14-19
 Request to admit expert testimony as relevant for PSC staff
- Pg. C 1-6 15 paragraphs numbered
 Opposing counsel item #9 my contention
 Paragraph 3&4 definition of AMI
 Paragraph 6 AMI is not mechanical/traditional MO statutory
 Interpreting statutory law requirement Digital equipment
 Paragraph 8 MO statute 407.0005
 Paragraph 9 Judge must use all MO statutes to interpret
 Columbia L & P sample template digital AMI vs mechanical
 Paragraph 10 PSC must uphold Consumer choice and seek
 That Consumer makes a written choice to pick meter type
 Fair trade and competition laws Consumer choice consent
 Remaining paragraphs on breach of contract etc etc
- Pg. D. EVIDENTIARY evidence police report on Vendor trespass
 This vendor reads our meter from the alley they do not just
 Show up declaring out of the blue two decades into goods
 Services contract of Analog to impromptu unannounced
 Give their sales tactic claim they are here to switch my
 Type of meter then return again to insist they are taking it

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Elizabeth Peterson,)
)
 Complainant,)
)
 v.)
)
 The Empire District Electric Company d/b/a)
 Liberty,)
 Respondent)

Case No. EC-2026-0150

NOTICE OF RULINGS AT PREHEARING CONFERENCE

Issue Date: January 16, 2026

On January 13, 2026, the Commission held a prehearing conference to discuss the nature of the alleged violations, the scope of this complaint, and the outstanding motion to stay this complaint. At the prehearing conference the Regulatory Law Judge sought to clarify the violations alleged in the Complaint. Complainant, Elizabeth Peterson, explained that the complaint before the Commission was her own complaint and not the complaint of an individual residing with her. Complainant explained that she did not want any meter with a circuit board at her residence, and she did not believe the opt-out meter that she would receive met the definition of a "traditional meter" contained in Section 386.820 RSMo. Complainant also expressed concern over the safety of extremely-low frequency (ELF) electric and magnetic fields (EMF) related to a meter with a circuit board.

please strike

Rulings

There is not any difference in EMF
 Both types RF and ELF are the same in "strength" the word low is not indicative of strength OR level of EMF strength

The Staff of Commission (Staff) filed a motion to stay the case pending clarification of the alleged violation. The Commission did not grant Staff's motion, but instead gave it until March 31, 2026, to file a report and recommendation about the complaint. Staff was

The Transcript for Conference

Pg. 40 14-19 Regards relevance of the rule making hearing That hearing is relevant for Staff to do research on EMF of non RF Advanced meter The reason I described the type of EMF with this model is as you can understand the confusion is that it seems to describe it has no RF that is indicative of the wireless form or type of EMF

The type of EMF that the model does have is delineated as EMF;ELF. The word **low** is "**not**" indicative of strength of the EMF emit it is merely a form or type description of specificity of which frequency the EMF is traveling I.E. that the value of the EMF wave or microwave is traveling in a manner considered via hardwire is ELF not "wireless" wireless is RF. These are the two version's or types of EMF.

The non RF Advanced meter was technically diagnosed by the EMRS expert Rob Workman. He under oath was presenting for court use now as relevance to how this case needs a citation method to comprehend what the EMF that occurs from the Non RF Advanced meter emits as far as how the toxicity of EMF from the non RF Advanced meter emit takes seat into the interior quality of the home wiring circuitry.

The Expert's information provided is vital to this case as it is the exact research that your PSC staff attorney is looking to find for his research. This meter was scientifically diagnosed in that rule making hearing and it is relevant in conclusion of fact of EMF emit from the model of the

non RF Advanced meter that my case involves per the Vendor's insistence that it is handy and available to them as a substitute for the Analog. The model is not a substitute for a NON EMF meter the only meter that has no EMF emit is an ANALOG mechanical meter.

Here is that link to the video hearing I can pull from YT the transcript if Staff would like to have that as well. It is an 8 minute summary with all the research that Staff is needing to conclude the EMF from the model that is not suitable as it is not SAFE from EMF. EMF is a known carcinogen World Health Organization class 2b classification. The wording ELF the word low again does not mean the affect of the EMF is low in strength. My expert will be glad to appear at the hearing for this case's future be it conference or actual hearing by the facts for any other research that the case should require. In response it would be up to Opposing counsel to obtain there own scientist who can find any real expert who would deny or disprove the EMRS specialist his credentials I have submitted already. If opposing counsel has thus far presented no evidence to disprove the EMF emit is occurring from the non RF Advanced meter then as such he is in abatement of what the ALJ Judge had requested.

<https://www.youtube.com/live/4va5grbxrJI?si=1coMzg7dBYyAxUod&t=2395>

this is cued up in the rule making hearing at the point of expert's 8 min testimony. This is from OX-2026-0045. Let me know if I should print out the transcript from the Commissions youtube for those 8 minutes provided Expert on this non RF Advanced meter.

opposing Counsel #9 has declared that the non RF Advanced meter is a non AMI meter he has also stated according to statute 386.820 that is is interpreted according to a version of interpretation that alleges that a non RF Advanced meter is categorically a Traditional meter.

#1 The counter point that opposing counsel is not addressing is that by standard interpretation of Traditional meter universally understood in language beyond the concept's broad approach of interpretation must in all scientific honestly fit the statutory that is compromised when statutory interprets statutory as conclusion of law is up to the ALJ Judge to determine with all the facts of MO statutes not just an interpretation that opposing counsel or even one Commission retorted a comment to which is merely an admittance that something is comfortable but that lacks testing of statutory which is why there is an Judge and Administrative caselaw to review and gain perspective of FULL statutory in MO laws.

#2 As, I pointed out the definition of Digital Equipment in MO Statutory is concise and scientifically a ANALOG meter as a mechanical meter having no digital parts cannot be construed as an Advanced meter or Digital meter. The term AMI meter is not part of the concept of the terms we are discussing. But, since opposing counsel insists on bringing in an additional term AMI an AMI meter is a Digital Meter.

#3 The same way that a Analog non digital meter cannot be construed even in funny wording of statute 386.820 we cannot categorical a mechanical Analog meter as an Advanced or Digital meter or an AMI digital meter.

#4 The opposite is true with the three wordings I just used backwards we cannot categorically put an Advanced OR and AMI or as both of these are Digital we cannot claim that they are mechanical meters.

#5 A mechanical meter is a Traditional meter according to that the fact that it is

not Digital

#6 The other two types of Digital as really one in the same but okay for the sake of saying AMI is digital AMI is digital and Advanced AMI is Digital yes Advanced AMI is digital are DIGITAL meters mechanical no they are not so they cannot be in a classification of Traditional Meters as traditional meters are delineated in that they are not DIGITAL

#7 The only Traditional meter is an Mechanical meter ANALOG. there is no other interpretation in General consensus of statutory interpreting statutory so again the meter I have is an ANALOG it releases no EMF it is satisfactory and if it is slow we will pay an increase in that rate of slowness via per usage. The current meter is completely functional it is operational fully operational and it is part of the initial contract of services and good of quality of meter built to last and not produce harmful radiation. The point is I initially told that this is breach of contract and I maintain that is still the case. The Company cannot encumber with their sales tactics to put on subpar quality digital meters that get replaced every 7 years costing \$200 to the Consumer. I have not signed to change to that subpar meter. I have no involvement in their ploy to call the opt out program or whatever it is. We passed that hurdle in 2020 and stayed with our own original meter of which we do not wish to sign up for Advanced meters program whatsoever. The tariff is the part and parcel of the illusory the gimmick of a false dichotomy of choosing two types of Digital meters one wireless one non wireless regardless of the AMI description or non AMI description or whatever else description they are all Digital meters if they are not mechanical meters. We have a mechanical meter we do not want to change the line of goods and services that are quality with clean energy and no EMF we do not partake in the sales tactics. WE will pay to a rate increase for any slowness in our meter that was detected at %. But the meter is not broken it is fully functional and it will last for another 50 years or until we pass away whichever comes first.

#8 Again please find general statutory to interpret the type of meter as Digital Title XXVI Trade and Commerce chapt 407 defines 407.005 the rectification of Digital is fixed scientifically to be indicative of AMI or Advanced meters one in the same

both are DIGITIZED equipment and DIGITAL meters are not mechanical meters
 Traditional Meters are mechanical in the reverse of this the meaning of non
 digital would be the word mechanical and that is concise conclusion of law

#9 As an ALJ Judge you have to take into consideration that the interpretation of
 an Advanced meter rule might need further interpretation by legitimate General
 statutory. We cannot change science of how equipment is categorized even if it
 seems comfortable for the a version of interpretations in statute 386.820 The fact
 that the confusion is confounded the opposing counsel it is still just that an
 interpretation with a very very broad approach of vantage point that is unrealistic.
 Let me also resubmit the explanation from the Columbia MO Light and power as
 they describe the mechanical meter it is set apart entirely from their AMI meter it
 is in their wording specificity to describe that the Mechanical meter is the old
 Analog. As the new standard is the Digital or AMI meter or advanced meters.
 Columbia Light and power shows two choices for the Consumer the mechanical
 meter or the DIGITAL meters. The wording itself needs to be accessible as a
 CHOICE to participate in according to Consumer consent and written decision.
 The Columbia light and power want to accommodate what the Consumer's needs
 are. The Consumer's who are health conscience are wanting to stay with
 Mechanical meters.

#10 The PSC has no jurisdiction to support permissively forcing upon the
 Consumer's to take what the Vendor's want to force upon us. The Vendor's are a
 business the goods and services they provide the Public are a free choice the
 Public uses their right of way easement to allow the vendor to place a meter. The
 PSC has the right to come into that easement and inspect the meter regardless if
 the Vendor seems to feel an ownership to the meter. The true ownership is the
 Consumer's choice to a meter that is right for their needs. The health conscience
 Consumer is not interested in Digital meters for health concerns. It is not outside
 the jurisdiction to review as a Judge to what extent is the Vendor purporting to
 own something that is actually a good that the Consumer is using via the
 oversight of the PSC. The business of the Vendor is of course to make money, but
 the Consumer is a biological being with health needs and justified concerns. Why
 else would there be such a big push by the Vendor's to talk about an opt out???

The admission of this by my Gas provider is already in writing and I have submitted that they wrote how they understood that I wanted to keep my Analog as my opt out meter due to health reason. The only thing they have not done is try to obsound with my ANALOG meter. Which is what happened with Liberty they showed up at my door claiming to be phasing out Mechanical meters I told them they have no jurisdiction to do so. They in turn stated they have the right to test it immediately then if I intend on keeping it. That is how they attempted and keep attempting to unlawfully remove my SAFE ANALOG meter. And then they ask me what my claim is my claim is the advanced meter or AMI all the Digital are unsuitable and that I did not consent to any changes in our meter that we chose ANALOG since the beginning of our contract.

#11 Do you notice that with Columbia light and power it takes a signature to make such a change and it is initiated by the Consumer as a request. The fact is we never requested to change our meter. We have never signed anything nor consented to Digital AMI or Advanced Digital meters. The opposing counsel is skipping these points in his narrative pocket where he is comfortabel quoting his interpretation of what he has to do as far as his obligations to PSC regulatory where in the regulatory does it allow for our consent to be done by assumption and somehow eliminated in that context of framework where opposing counsel is simply reciting his pocket of interpretation?

#12 This account was established well before whatever these digital meters came along. The sales tactics are just that tactic and the subpar equipment of these Digital meters subsequently effects the services as the clean energy becomes dirty due to the invade of the circuit boards inside these Advanced AMI DIGITAL meters. There is both sides of this coin to use Court Judgement whereby to remedy with the FULL SCOPE of MO statutory on this digital equipment as not mechanical. The EMF is not safe. The HHS secretary JFK Jr. opened an investigation after our preliminary hearing. The rules of investigate further to get those to help interpret that EMF is a verified carcenogen you staff can google world health organization it's on their website as a class 2b carcenogen.

#13 The scope of this matter is not defined and end of conclusion of law by having

opposing counsel repeat statute 386.820 that is his response after 2 weeks of diligent research. He is using every excuse to box you into his interpretation and simply making it his job not to answer on EMF which then why did his own Tariff have to have an opt out? what is the public health concern if not EMF RF of the wireless version of the Advanced meter?? The notion of opt out speaks for itself that in fact the rules of PSC must have taken into consideration that EMF is a health risk. So, now that I have an expert that can explain there is also EMF in the non RF Advanced meter that when you open it up the guts are identical and the SMPS circuit board still is there it is still making transient's that are toxic and invading our service lines of what is clean energy trying to make its way from our pole into our home without any toxic invade of the circuit board D.E. dirty electricity. So, now that I have an expert who can prove that along with many reports of white papers from Engineers. I can submit. But, here is the one thing Opposing counsel will not answer are all Advanced meters causing EMF? He is avoiding that and he was asked to answer. The fact is yes all of the Advanced meters create D.E. and that is toxic emit injected into our service lines per the Advanced meter invade inject. This is not disputeable that is why opposing counsel will not respond.

#14 The purpose of goods and services is quality and clean energy and safe equipment. I signed up for that I'm currently in that same contract. I do not want the sales tactics they attempted at my door numerous times since October. The reasonable goods I will maintain are the Analog meter I will maintain to keep it by retention as I have not signed for a different type of service goods that are subpar and cause fires as there is not a ground to surge protection in any Advanced meters.

#15 This unscrupulous way that the Vendor is trying to sell subpar equipment is obvious and the interpretation of thier version of what FULL MO statutory dedicates to explain what a DIGITAL meter would be is not a Traditional mechanical meter. In fact this is MMPA MO Merchandising Protections Act violation.

(AMR) system starting in 1996. These meters are still being used today. Once a month, a reading from the meter is taken from the street via a radio signal through a hand-held device.

According to Chapter 27-95 of the City's Code of Ordinances, Columbia Water & Light supplies and installs customer meters. The City of Columbia's current term and supply contract is for meters that have automatic meter reading capabilities.

Pg. C'6 of 6
Supports
item #9

Requesting a 'mechanical meter'

A residential customer can request to have a mechanical analog meter installed but they are costly to read and maintain. Because mechanical meters are no longer domestically manufactured, there is a \$75 fee to cover the costs of purchasing and refurbishing an old analog meter. A monthly fee of \$5 will be charged to manually read the meter. A customer can switch back to a standard meter at any time and the \$5 monthly charge will be discontinued. To request a non-standard mechanical meter, contact the City of Columbia billing office by calling 573.874.7380 or drop by their office at 701 E. Broadway. You will need to sign an agreement for this service.

Access to utility data

Columbia Water & Light does not know what customers are doing with the electricity supplied, only the amount used. Employees transfer usage data once a month directly from the handheld reader device through the City of Columbia's secured computer network to the billing system. Columbia Water & Light does not sell utility usage data. According to the Missouri Sunshine laws, usage data could be

JOPLIN

POLICE DEPARTMENT



Police Department
303 E. 3rd Street
Joplin, Missouri 64801
417-623-3131

CFS - Command Log

Printed on February 11, 2026

CFS # 2026002224
Call Taker Maggie Moore
Location 1221 N EUCLID AVE, JOPLIN, MO 64801
Location Details
Primary Incident Code CALL : OFFICER NEEDS TO CALL
Mod
Priority 3
Use Caution No
Primary Disposition HANDLED BY OFFICER
Beat 10
Zone 10
Call Time 01/08/26 11:13:33
Completed Time 01/08/26 11:57:11

Reporters

PETERSON, ELIZABETH (Initial Reporter)

Sex Not Specified
DOB
Address
Report Time 01/08/26 11:13:00
How Reported
From Phone (417) 629-8789
Contact Phone
Comments

Other Names

Vehicles

Responders

263 (Primary)	1198 - Allman, Jason	JPD (Primary)
---------------	----------------------	---------------

Response Times

Assigned 01/08/26 11:21:23
Enroute 01/08/26 11:21:33 *
Staged
Arrived 01/08/26 11:21:33
Backup Requested
Backup Arrived
Leaving
Arrived At
Completed 01/08/26 11:57:11

IR / External Agency Numbers

Command Log Filter: All Commands | Details: Hidden | Units: All Units | Revised Entries: Shown

01/08/26 11:13:33 | Moore, Maggie | New CFS
 01/08/26 11:16:56 | Moore, Maggie | Log - RP STATED SHE WANTS TO FILE TRESPASSING CHARGES AGAINST THE UTILITY COMPANY FOR TRYING TO REPLACE THE METER ON HER HOME WHICH SHE BELIEVES IS A FIRE HAZARD
 01/08/26 11:17:29 | Moore, Maggie | Log - SHE STATES SHES CONTACT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE STATE INSPECTOR, THE FIRE INSPECTOR, THE CITY ATTORNEY, THE CITY MANAGER, AND THE UTILITY COMPANY DIRECTOR AND THIS IS AN ON GOING ISSUE
 01/08/26 11:18:02 | Moore, Maggie | Log - SHE WANTS TO PRESS CHARGES AGAINST THEM FOR TRESPASSING AND DAMAGING THE CURRENT METER ON HER HOME IN THE PROCESS OF TRYING TO REPLACE IT WITH A NEWER METER WHICH SHE BELIEVES IS A FIRE HAZARD
 01/08/26 11:21:23 | Chapman, Bobby | 263 | Dispatch
 01/08/26 11:21:33 | Allman, Jason | 263 | On Scene
 01/08/26 11:21:37 | Allman, Jason | 263 | Clear Alarms
 01/08/26 11:56:24 | Allman, Jason | Log - ELIZABETH PETERSON ADVISED THE ELECTRIC COMPANY CAME UNANNOUNCED TO HER FRONT DOOR AND KNOCKED. PETERSON STATED SHE NEVER RECEIVED A PHONE CALL PRIOR TO THEIR ARRIVAL. PETERSON CLAIMED THEY WANTED TO REPLACE HER METER ON HER HOUSE. PETERSON DECLINED AND THEN THE INDIVIDUALS ADVISED THEY NEEDED TO TEST THE OLD METER. PETERSON FOLLOWED THEM AND OBSERVED THEM TEST THE METER AND THEN THEY LEFT. INDIVIDUALS RETURNED LATER AND STATED THEY NEEDED TO REPLACE THE METER AND PETERSON DECLINED. PETERSON ADVISED SHE WENT TO THE SENATOR AND SEVERAL OTHER GOVERNMENT OFFICES TO GET THE NEW METER BANNED. EVENTUALLY PETERSON STATED SHE WANTED TO PURSUE CHARGES FOR THE INDIVIDUALS TRESPASSING. I ADVISED I WOULD NOT SUBMIT CHARGES FOR TRESPASSING FOR PPL KNOCKING ON HER FRONT DOOR W/O PRIOR NOTICE AND SHE ESCORTED / - OBSERVED THE INDIVIDUALS TESTING HER METER. PETERSON THEN REQUESTED TO SPEAK WITH THE 'CAC'. I WAS UNAWARE OF THE CAC AND SPOKE TO 209 WHO ADVISED THEY DON'T EXIST W/IN THE DEPARTMENT. I CALLED PETERSON BACK AND INFORMED HER AND THEN ENDED THE PHONE CALL.
 01/08/26 11:57:11 | Allman, Jason | 263 | Available

I could not stop them
 Two walked back to the meter said the Owned it had the Right to Test impromptu

CLQ

Requested At
 Sent To
 Status
 Received At
 Location
 Accuracy

They told me it tested fine I have a witness inside who heard Everything they stated Verbally it was FINE.
 on the Second impromptu unannounced they said they reviewed and that the Report was Not fine and that they actually Knew this on the initial visit?
 Second visit was very aggressive that next time they would be back to take my Analog or shut me OFF my choice.