

Redacted

Dear Mr. Peevey,

We received a letter the CPUC Consumer Affairs Branch, sent on December 13th, in response to our letter that had been sent on December 6th. In the CPUC's response to us, the following two statements were made about "Smart Meters," having been taken from a study released in January 2011 by the California Council on Science and Technology:

1. "Wireless smart meters, when installed and properly maintained, result in much smaller levels of exposure than many existing common household electronic devices, particularly cell phones and microwave ovens."
2. "The current Federal Communications Commission (FCC) standard provides an adequate factor of safety against known thermally induced health impacts of existing common household electronic devices and Smart Meters."

We have some questions for which we respectfully request answers from the CPUC and/or PG&E.

1. Regarding statement #1 above, were the duty cycles of cell phones and microwave ovens taken into account? That is to say, given that "Smart Meters" are always in active use, and are always powered on during any given day, whereas cell phones and microwave ovens are either not in active use, or are either powered off entirely, for most of any given day, how was this difference taken into account in the CCST study of January, 2011?
2. Regarding statement #1 above, how did the aforementioned CCST study compare *whole body exposure* to "Smart Meter" radiation to *whole body exposure* to cell phone radiation (versus *peak exposure to the ear* for the cell phone)?
3. In the January 2011 study released by the CCST, and again in an April 2011 study released by the CCST, there is a graph entitled "**Instantaneous Radio Frequency Power Density Levels of Common Devices (in microwatts/cm²)**." In the April study it is **Figure 7**. The source which is cited for this graph is the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). It is our understanding that the EPRI is an advocacy group for the electric power industry. Do you have any *independent* scientific analysis to confirm or support the specific attestation of this graph? If so, could you please provide us with this?
4. Regarding statement #2 above, specifically what studies were done to provide an adequate factor of safety against *non-thermally* induced health impacts of existing common household electronic devices and "Smart Meters," and, given the long latency period for many types of cancer, *how long was the span of time* for which these studies were conducted?

Our family is being asked to trust PG&E on the matter of "Smart Meter" safety. We are, however, hard-pressed to give that trust in light of the historical record of PG&E's violation of the public trust; violations involving property damage, bodily injury, and even death in places like Hinkley, CA, and San Bruno, CA.

In my last two correspondences, I requested that the "Smart Meter" be removed and replaced with an analog meter. As of the date of this letter, the "Smart Meter" is still attached to our residence. I still have not received a satisfactory response addressing our concerns from you, nor from CPUC, nor from anyone at PG&E. Again, please advise what remedy(s) can be made to replace the existing "Smart Meter" at our home with an analog meter.

Your timely response to our request is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Redacted

cc: Sidney Bob Dietz
Thomas Bottorff