
Fw: reference Case No. OX-2026-0045 Residential Advanced Metering Public Comment

From Buffy Peterson <buffypeterson@hotmail.com>
Date Thu 3/5/2026 9:02 AM
To Sarah Schappe <sarah.schappe@senate.mo.gov>

Dear JCAR,

The original docket for the Rule 20 CSR 4240-10.035 as for Public interest hearing was held on Nov 13, 2025. The vote by PSC Commissioners was not finalized as a decision and therefore promptly was announced on Jan 7, 2026.

I promptly filed within 10 days from that Decision the Petitions grafting out of OX-2026-0045 with procedural to transfer to a NEW CASE filed as an intervention by the Public as myself representing the Public and that is in my Brief on this CASE rendered with JCAR Case # OX-2026-0180.

The Regulatory current version is containing the overall lack of any Public interest. The Regulator as the PSC did in fact in continuum does not have the Public's interest represented. In other words the structural or proponents of the Regulatory on Advanced Meters is not by the Regulator being represented in that is why the Public under the procedural I utilized has now rendered this Petition.

The right to petition is not per the fact that the Public is not being properly represented at all in this Advanced Meter current Regulatory.

It is therefore not premature that is not a plausible response that is adequate or applicable to the current need of the Public to Petition any Regulatory that *does not have the Public's best interest and in fact is **absence** of Public interest* - "in the Regulatory proponents" if the Public is not being represented in the proponents of Regulatory then we have the right to Petition. The deny of that Petition even by a Judge's reasonable explanation of prematurity based objections is moot. The proponents are already in play and are actually being used against the Public in Case EC-2026-0150 based on no Health accountability of the Regulations' edict and dogma and the statute, clause and Tariff proponents are being allowed as proceedings in that altercation case with the Vendor to disadvantage not only the Public, but in fact to disadvantage the same Judge who must use the Regulatory cited by Vendor opposing Counsel to attempt to persuade what the Regulatory proponents extract out and define to be indicative of in regard to subject of alternate metering that is not extracted to be clarified by the Public is disallowed to substitute due to EMF emissions that must be literally addressed in a Petition CASE in order to render Regulatory definition. Public vs. Vendor vs. Regulator. The Regulator PSC Commission is not adherence to Public Scientist Expert who already told them in the Public Hearing that their statute is being interpreted improperly by the Commissioners and to take time to clarify the wording to render Analog Meter as the qualities of Traditional as exclusively and by the statute authentic scientific finite facts that equate to a non EMF metering even under the wording which to a layman and apparently to the Commission is not necessary to define by the scientific terms in the statute but rather to give an implied context acceptance towards grafting in the ability for Vendors to alternatively via the tariff proponent that Vendors only need to substitute what's readily available and not adhere to the actual authentic definition of the statute's vetting by a

scientist I.E. The interest of the Public is the use of an Expert Scientist in the field of what is called Frequencies Electromagnetic.

The Public cannot be denied due process of petition and the administrative remedy thereof as

THE petition is required in order to bring the INTEREST of the Public who is not being Represented by the Regulator PSC Commission as the PSC Commission does not have the interest of the Public in their decision that was made on Jan. 7, 2026.

The Regulatory proponents cannot defy Public Representation by myself via PETITION. The ability to submit Referendum or to Petition the Government is protected speech any Petition is First Amendment Speech. So, We asked as the Public plainly if they listened to our Hearing public comments and expert witness their response was they like things the way the are... so to speak they ignored the Expert. This was retort to comment we like our definition and yet the Regulator never defined that definition scientifically in retort of the Experts definitions. The PSC asked us not questions at the hearing none ZERO their comments were one sentence long placed online later and very trite in response. That they were so trite it is clear they did not want to hear our side of the definition of the proponents and the scientific vetting of the statute. This is a Regulator who was given opportunity to represent the Publics interest, but they did not.

Therefore, the Public must via Petition Represent this MATTER by myself against the Regulator PSC Commission per the Commission does not have the publics interest in this matter. I again re address with the Judge that the Public we must Petition as free speech without denial of due process under the first amendment of the MO Constitution and under that same right for Administrative remedy.

It is indispensable to a FAIR STATE HEARING PROCESS and Fair resolution to our Petition as the Proponents of the Regulatory as interpreted by the Regulator do not uphold the Publics best interest or their interest at all. Up to this point the Public has spoken at the Hearing public comment but there was nobody on the Regulator who listened to our vested interest as worthy or valid and in fact that is denial of our Public Interest of the Regulatory proponents which must be given Public interpretation intervention and by myself to proceed to correct the Commissioners interpretation. It is my position that no Public interest was protected with the aforementioned public Hearing and if the OPC Office of Public Counsel tried they too were denied to be taken into account to represent the interest of the Public which has in continuance been denied.

This Petition must be allowed to proceed and the right of Free Speech of the Public's interest must be given a Fair due process as not once has the PSC Commission listened or represented the Public on this matter of our position and our interpretation of the Regulatory proponents which are currently denying the right of the Public in case # EC-2026-0150.

Sincerely
Elizabeth Peterson on behalf of the Public
417-629-8789

Again here is the cued up link to the testimony 8 minutes in person of the EMRS Expert at that Public comment hearing OX-2026-0045

In this testimony which is not on a transcript, the Expert explains that the metering Advanced meter as the opt out model non-RF Advanced meter does in fact emit EMF in the home environment.

This model is unacceptable to substitute and invade by forced substitution upon the Public as it is HEALTH threat and life threatening to the Public see case EC-2026-0150 and the Medical documentation thereof which indicates a stroke will be invoked by EMF equipment metering and that is illegal to substitute a Medically clearance by Physician note otherwise than an ANALOG

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

Rob Workman
Workman Home Improvements
Owner, EMRS Specialist
Certified Building Biology
Environmental Consultant
C: 314-517-1608
H: 636-294-0896

From: robworkman <robworkman@proton.me>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 4:58 PM
To: nancy.dippell@psc.mo.gov <nancy.dippell@psc.mo.gov>
Cc: geoff.marke@opc.mo.gov <geoff.marke@opc.mo.gov>; Buffy Peterson <BuffyPeterson@hotmail.com>
Subject: reference Case No. 0X-2026-0045 Residential Advanced Metering Public Comment

Hi Nancy,

I am commenting on why we need an Analogue Mechanical Meter Non RF as a specific language in the new Bill.

Non Rf Digital meters are bad for Missouri Residents

1. Switch mode power supply is needed to convert from A/C current to D/C and to lower voltages which will create dirty power throughout the home. This is not needed in an Analogue which runs on Eddy current.
2. The Digital Non Rf meter will charge extra during a window of Peak time which is discriminatory against the poor, disabled, retirees, and stay at home families.
3. The window of time charge is discrimination against the Muslim faith since the window of time extra time will be during time of prayer which will be during peak billing time.

The five daily prayer times

Fajr: Dawn prayer, before sunrise

Dhuhr: Noon prayer, after the sun has passed its highest point

Asr: Afternoon prayer

Maghrib: Sunset prayer, just after the sun has set

Isha: Night prayer, around nightfall

We have a privacy issue since the utility will have access to each product or device being used. The usage for each appliance or electrical usage device will be charged peak voltage during a 15-minute window for a full 15 minutes even if the appliance or light bulb is only being used for 1 second. The Digital Non Rf has never been time tested for how long it will last and will need a software update every 5 to 7 years which will cost the consumers 150 million each time this is done. The analogue

Mechanical Meter will last 30 to 60 years. The Digital Non RF can not have a synchronized clock to tell what time it is to charge extra. The RF is needed for that to be accurate.

Thank you
Rob Workman

Rob Workman
Workman Home Improvements
Owner, EMRS Specialist
Certified Building Biology
Environmental Consultant
C: 314-517-1608
H: 636-856-0424
o: 636 317-1977

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.