

Walter Clemence

From: Howland [jshhwh@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 09, 2012 3:25 PM
To: Walter Clemence; Mark Futrell
Subject: Comments for Record Entry for the September 20, 2012 Smart Meter Workshop

Mr. Clemence:

You related at the September workshop that we could send items by October 12th. I have tried repeatedly to send this as a separate document to all the commissioners, but it keeps failing. So I am sending to you within this e-mail and ask that you forward if possible. A separate e-mail will contain the photo of our Utility Room which is INTERIOR. Not in a basement and not on an outside wall.

Thank you.
 Hope Howland
 Flagler Beach, FL

October 8, 2012

To: Florida Public Service Commissioners:

Ronald A. Brise, Chairman
 Lisa Polak Edgar
 Art Graham
 Eduardo E. Balbis
 Julie Imanuel Brown

cc: Walter Clemence (Chair of Sept. 20th Workshop for PSC)
cc: Mark Futrell

Re: September 20, 2012 Workshop Regarding Smart Meters

I was in attendance at the recent workshop and during the public portion, I was allowed to speak. I do appreciate that courtesy. I was disappointed, however to see that you commissioners were not there, but were represented by your staff.

At this September 20th workshop, I requested a full public hearing regarding smart meters. A hearing that would be docketed (under oath) and not an "un-docketed" workshop such as the one that took place. I also requested a moratorium on installing smart meters (in particular, grouped or multiple **INTERIOR** smart meters) until further study could be done and safety fully proclaimed.

During the entire proceedings, I noted that little attention was paid to multiple or groups of smart meters. Your questionnaire contained only one question out of 22 concerning groups. Multiple **INTERIOR** meters received little, if any attention.

I noted that . . .

The utility industry's own Edison Electric report states that generally multiple or grouped meters are on OUTSIDE walls or in the BASEMENT of a high rise.

(Reference: Section 4.2, Page 10 of following report
http://www.eei.org/ourissues/electricitydistribution/Documents/Smart_Meters_RF_exposure.pdf)

Our condo falls under neither of those conditions and I displayed a photo at the September 20th workshop and I will forward that photo separately.

In our condo (which is our permanent residence) interior banks of 30 analog meters are currently located on the second, fifth and eighth floors in utility rooms approximately 17 x 8 x 7. The current meters are approximately 8 feet from occupied living spaces and directly face into those spaces. Not on an outside wall. Not in a basement.

These utility rooms contain multiple metal surfaces: an A/C, a hot water heater, and pipes. Reflectivity and hot spots could occur with these interior meters. Maintenance access is required for these rooms. Tenants require entrance at times. Can the PSC and the FCC (the 2 regulating agencies for smart meters) assure safety in regard to 2 hazards – that of fire and health - in such a situation?

It has been asserted that only a very few daily transmissions from a single meter take place in a day, but this is by no means always true nor is there any guarantee of a maximum number of transmissions, since the meters may be reprogrammed at will. For example, Southern California Edison reported to the California Public Utilities Commission that their meters, on average, transmitted 10% of the time for meter data (scheduled and/or on-demand) and 90% of the transmissions for network command and control (synchronization, security, data integrity and self-healing). In addition, there are what are referred to as transmissions outside of the daily schedule such as “tamper/theft alerts” etc. even though one gentleman at the September 20th meeting asserted that “no criminal would bother with a smart meter and its information when there are other ways to commit a lucrative criminal act! (Ref. Pgs. 4-6, SCE Response to Question 2, 2c & 3: <http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/efile/RESP/151048.pdf>)

You have received the Flagler Beach, Florida resolution by our City Commissioners. You have also received the Flagler County Commissioner's letter asking for further study. I can forward to you if necessary.

The outdated 1996 FCC guidelines were developed for radio antennas and cell towers, and did not envision banks of antennas continuously firing away into living spaces. These guidelines consider only thermal effects of radiation: they guarantee that the antenna will not raise your body temperature. They do not consider the more subtle toxic effects of ionizing radiation, which are well documented in a vast literature which the utilities choose to ignore. This was obvious as far back as 2002. See referenced document from the EPA. (Reference: http://www.emrpolicy.org/litigation/case_law/docs/noi_epa_response.pdf)

It is important to note that the corresponding standards in countries like Switzerland, Russia and Italy that take such effects into account are much **lower than the FCC standards**, and, industry calculations based on these standards frequently obtain favorable results by assuming very small “duty factors”. (Reference: http://www.emfservices.com/RF_intl_guidelines_secure.pdf)

The burden of proof of safety should be upon those who have jurisdiction over these meters. The public should not have the responsibility of proving them safe.

The utility stance that all costs concerned with customers opting out should be recovered is an insult to the taxpaying citizens of this country. You are aware that FPL alone received **\$200,000,000** in 2009 to start this program. That money came from the taxpayer. (Reference: <http://www.tampabay.com/news/politics/stateroundup/article1047409.ece>)

Now, utilities are demanding more from taxpayers who do not want smart meters. This edict is from a monopoly. Citizens have no choice to change to a different utility company. Citizens did not have a public hearing about these smart meters. Citizens have essentially had a change of contract forced upon them.

The utilities state that their “infrastructure” would be at risk if they do not receive a one-time lump sum and a monthly additional sum from those opting out. This demand does not garner any sympathy from a taxpayer who has already contributed.

The stated "benefits" to the customer to have such a meter is minimal in reality. Accessing power usage on-line in real time is not essential to many. A conscientious, conservative minded customer will do the things they can to minimize their electricity usage without checking on a daily basis to see where or when the electricity is being used.

If smart meters were really beneficial to the consumer, they would have been introduced with great fanfare, rather than surreptitiously, as has been the case.

The main benefit of these meters is to the utility and not the customer. Time of usage rates will be imposed. Control will be imposed upon individuals without notification.

Natural disasters do occur and the utilities usually deal with them most competently, and citizens appreciate that. But, **to force these meters upon all citizens without proof of safety first**, in the name of national preparedness and national conservation of electricity is to possibly set in motion that very disaster which everyone wants to avoid! Waiting years for safety results could be deadly. Think of tobacco, Vioxx and others.

Ask yourselves this question: Do you want to be known as the PSC of 2012 who passed on to future generations that which was proved safe, or that which was not proved unsafe? There is a difference.

Unless and until the risks of multiple, interior, smart meters can definitely be ruled out, it seems prudent to avoid their use and they should be banned without penalty by the PSC.

Thank you for your consideration and attention.

Hope W. Howland

3580 S. Ocean Shore Blvd. #507
Flagler Beach, FL 32136

Walter Clemence

From: Howland [jshhwh@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 09, 2012 3:35 PM
To: Walter Clemence; Mark Futrell
Subject: H. Howland Utility Room - Showing Interior Meters - For September 20th Record Entry

I was unable to send the separate file, so I am trying this. Please enter into the records for the September 20th Smart Meter Workshop where I was present and spoke briefly during the public portion. Thank you.

Hope Howland
Flagler Beach, FL

Flagler Beach, FL

A Condo INTERIOR Utility Room - Not on Outside Wall & NOT in a Basement!

(See Edison Electric Report Below)

http://www.eei.org/ourissues/electricitydistribution/Documents/Smart_Meters_RF_exposure.pdf

Opposite Elevator Banks At Core of Condo

5th Floor Utility Room Shown - Size: Approx. 17 x 8 x 8

Meters FACE TOWARD Occupied Living Quarters!



Is This Safe?

Possible Scenario for Reflectivity Problems & Hot Spots? Since

ALL 3 UTILITY ROOMS CONTAIN Metal Surfaces:

- 30 Analog Meters (Metal)**
- Water Heater (Metal Surface)**
- AC Unit (Metal Surface)**
- Multiple Pipes (Metal)**
- Maintenance Access**
- Tenant Storage Access**



2 Views From Corner Looking Out

Aerial View Showing Condo "Y" Shape Construction Thus, Elevator Shaft & Utility Rooms are Central to CORE of Condo



Is This Safe?

Neighbor Condo With Same Configuration



View From Doorway Looking In

Verizon Antennas at 4 Corners of Sign on Roof - Approx. 20 ft. from 8th Floor Utility Room



Can the PSC & FCC Guarantee

This to be Safe ?

