

On Jan 31, 2011, at 7:34 PM, Garril Page wrote:  
Dr. Long and Gentlemen:

As has been pointed out by other respondents, this report suffers serious deficiencies.

I expected quantitative, independent study; however, none was undertaken. [page 6. "CCST has not undertaken primary research of its own to address these issues". ] The title and task of this report led people to expect a valid and definitive response to concerns raised over Smart Meters, not a matter to be addressed in a "relatively rapid manner", based on approximately one hundred publications/postings and conversations with twenty-four (24) people.

Prominently quoted in the CCST analysis is the PG&E-commissioned Richard Tell Associates Report as well as testing by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). Since PG&E has admitted it has meters of differing strength, I wonder whether the emission rate of the meters studied was typical?

This report misleads by omission: pages 7-8, are clear in admitting CCST's lack of understanding about the effects caused by non-thermal low level radiation. My question: why dismiss research that indicates a firmer knowledge of these effects?

This omission enabled the report to ignore all scientific work that shows effect from non-thermal low level radiation. Convenient, perhaps, but neither correct nor profession behavior, especially since there is no "taking into account current exposure levels to radiofrequency and electromagnetic fields" which are virtually ubiquitous and increasing.

This report diverts with a information on household appliances having optional use. This is irrelevant when compared to inescapable, all-pervasive mesh of a smart grid deployment where path loss is represented by human body penetration.

The brief discussion of options to wireless concludes these are too costly and once again, compares inescapable smart grid radiation with optional-use cell phones. Why does this report contain zero advocacy for methods of transmitting data that have demonstrably less effect on living cells?

The report's simplistic one-two conclusion is irrelevant, misleading, and verges on misrepresentation. The attempt to deflect from recognition of effects caused by non-thermal low level radiation is clumsy; the omission is bald and obvious. Is the report's sole intent to reassure on the divergent subject of thermal radiation?

Your Project Team ignores at our peril the precautionary, prevention-oriented approach recommended in cancer studies, including the President's Cancer Panel, which emphasized that efforts to protect public health should be driven by science, and be free of political or industry influences.

Given the credentials of your Project Team, I had hoped for academic honesty and scientific rigor. Instead, apparent bias and political shading cause me to question the intent of this analysis. As a person who has written thousands of replies for members of Congress, I recognize selective writing when I read it.

Garril Page  
San Anselmo  
County of Marin CA  
[obility@comcast.net](mailto:obility@comcast.net)