



Radio Waves Hazard

COMMENTS OF WILNER AND ASSOCIATES RELATING TO CALIFORNIA COUNCIL  
ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY "HEALTH IMPACT OF RADIO FREQUENCY  
FROM SMART METERS" REPORT

David L. Wilner  
Wilner & Associates  
P.O. Box 2340  
Novato, CA 94948-2340  
415-898-1200  
[www.WilnerandAssociates.com](http://www.WilnerandAssociates.com)  
[DavidLWilner@aol.com](mailto:DavidLWilner@aol.com)

COMMENTS OF WILNER AND ASSOCIATES RELATING TO CALIFORNIA COUNCIL  
ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ("CCST") "HEALTH IMPACT OF RADIO  
FREQUENCY FROM SMART METERS" REPORT

Pity the unfortunate people that will suffer more radiation poisoning as a result of the report they paid for. The health consequences range from minor symptoms to total disability. They will also see the value of their homes fall due to the toxic nature of the radiation. It could be as much as 50% depending on the circumstances.

So, what's wrong with the report?

1. The report assumes that the SmartMeters are properly installed and maintained. The fact is that every installation is different due to the existing electrical wiring and grounding systems. In order to make the study credible, it would be necessary to make measurements in the field where the meters are actually installed.
2. The focus is on the Radio Frequency ("RF") output transmitted by the meter in the unlicensed portion of the spectrum at approximately 900 MHz. There is no mention of the switching-mode power supply RF interference that is generated at lower frequencies. This may be more of a problem, and should have been included in the study.
3. The report does point out that radio frequency transmissions in the non-thermal portion of the spectrum are not well understood. According to the report: "without a clear understanding of the biological mechanisms that play, the costs and benefits of additional standards for RF emitting devices including the Smart Meters, cannot be determined at this time" (p 23).

The report goes on to state: "While the FCC guidelines appear to provide a large factor of safety against known thermal effects of exposure to radiofrequency, they do not necessarily protect against potential non-thermal effects, nor do they claim to [emphasis added]. Without additional understanding of these effects, there is inadequate basis to develop additional guidelines at this time" (p15).

These are scary statements because all the frequencies involved in this report are in the non-thermal portion of the spectrum, and the FCC does have

guidelines that govern them. How could CCST miss this important fact, and then conclude there is no health problem associated with the SmartMeters?

4. The study also fails to consider the fact that there will be three (3) SmartMeters installed for each subscriber: Electric, gas, and water. Obviously, this would increase radiation levels, and should have been included in the findings.
5. Wilner & Associates did provide information to CCST on these important points, but it was not considered as part of the study.

## CONCLUSION

The people of California should get a refund for any costs that were involved in preparing the study because they didn't get what they paid for. This is much like the tobacco industry studies going back over the years where we were told that smoking wasn't harmful to our health. Obviously, that was not true. We believe what has been stated in this study sends almost the same message: Don't worry about it; the impact is negligible as far as scientific studies are concerned. If the public is expected to believe what it is being told about the SmartMeters, the CCST should go back to the drawing board, and conduct a new study that would be factual and correct.